

The Slavic and East European Journal

891.806
S6313

Vol. XVI, No. 1

Spring 1958

CONTENTS

Russian Futurism, Xlebnikov, Esenin... Renato Poggioli	3
Russian Émigré Scholars in Prague After World War I T. Riha	22
<u>Ne xlebom edinyx</u> : Revised Edition Tatiana Sklanczenko	27
The Revival of Dostoevskij on the Soviet Stage Fan Parker	33
The Phonemic System of Colloquial Standard Bulgarian Harold L. Klagstad, Jr.	42
The Sovietization of Albanian Education Joseph S. Roucek	55
REVIEWS	
Francis Dvornik, <u>The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization</u> Edward Stankiewicz	61
O. Georgij Šavel'skij, <u>Vospominanija poslednego proto- presvitera Russkoj armii i flota</u> ... Michael Ginsburg	62
Matthew Spinka, <u>The Church in Soviet Russia</u> Georges Florovsky	64
John N. Hazard, <u>The Soviet System of Government</u> Alfred G. Meyer	66
G. A. Tokaev, <u>Soviet Imperialism</u> Gerhart Niemeyer	67
Boris Meissner, <u>The Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Party Leadership, Organization and Ideology</u> Robert V. Daniels	68
Zbigniew Folejewski, <u>Studies in Modern Slavic Poetry, I</u> Robert L. Jackson	68
M. Karpovich and D. Čiževskij, eds. <u>Russkij literaturnyj arxiv</u> (Russian Literary Archives) Leon Stilman	70
Dmitrij Tschizewskij und Johann Schröpfer, <u>Russische literarische Parodien und Berufung und Bestimmung des Dichters in der slavischen Dichtung, I: Von den Anfängen bis zur Romantik</u> Leon I. Twarog	71
W. H. Bruford, <u>Anton Chekhov</u> Thomas G. Winner	73

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

M. V. Vishniak, " <u>Sovremennye zapiski</u> ": <u>Vospominaniya redaktora</u>	J. A. Posin	73
Vladimir Dudintsev, <u>Not by Bread Alone</u> ..	Walter Vickery	74
Haralds Biezais, <u>Die Hauptgöttinnen der alten Letten</u>	Reidar Th. Christiansen	76
A. A. Šaxmatov and P. A. Lavrov, eds. <u>Sbornik" XII věka Moskovskago Uspenskago sobora, Vol. I.</u>	Marc Szeftel	77
W. K. Matthews, <u>The Structure and Development of Russian</u>	Harry H. Josselson	78
Eugene A. Carpovich, <u>Russian-English Atomic Dictionary</u>	Nicolas W. Baklanoff	79
Ernest F. Haden and M. Irving Smith, <u>How to Pronounce Russian</u>	C. P. Lemieux	80
Horace G. Lunt, <u>Knŕga dlja čténija: An Accented Russian Reader</u>	Rebecca A. Domar	80
Alfred Senn, <u>Handbuch der litauischen Sprache, Band II: Lesebuch und Glossar</u>	William Schmalstieg	82
Recent Russian Vocal Recordings; Folk Recordings	J. T. S.	83
New Editions; Moscow Translations of Russian Classics	J. T. S.	85
Books Received		86
NEWS AND NOTES		89

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Editor

J. T. Shaw

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Review Editor

F. J. Oinas

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich

Zbigniew Folejewski

William E. Harkins

The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S. J.

Claude P. Lemieux

Horace Lunt

Oleg A. Maslenikov

J. B. Rudnyŕkyj

Anthony Salys

Thomas A. Sebeok

Gleb Struve

Nicholas Vakar

René Wellek

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon

Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

RUSSIAN FUTURISM, XLEBNIKOV, ESENIN

By Renato Poggioli

Harvard University

Russian Futurism

The first vague rumors about the manifestoes of Marinetti reached Russia in 1909.¹ On no other ground but the association of ideas created by the suggestive echo of that new name, the first to call themselves Futurists were a handful of young poets in Petersburg led by Igor' Severjanin and Vadim Šeršenevič. The latter was the theorist of the group and was later destined to become also the theorist of Imaginism. But the circle of the Moscow Futurists was more valid and solid, even if it became an effective center only a few years later. At first, to distinguish themselves from the Italian Futurists—upon the advice of their leader Xlebnikov, who was paradoxically a purist and an archaist in matters of language—they called themselves budetljane, a word coined on the third person of the future tense of the verb "to be" (budet), and which sounds in Russian like "those who will be," or "the men of the coming time." Later, they became better acquainted with the doctrines of Marinetti, who had just made a lecture tour in Russia, but who disappointed them with the political overtones of his speeches, already inspired by a kind of bourgeois imperialism. This led them to feel not only independent, but also different, from the original Franco-Italian branch of the same international movement. Later on, to distinguish themselves from their Petersburg rivals, to whom they were allied for a while, so that Severjanin was one of the signers of some of their early manifestoes, they named themselves Cubo-Futurists, showing that their rift with the Marinetti group did not prevent them from following with curiosity and interest the new advance-guard movements of

the West, not only in the field of letters, but also in the field of the arts, as proved by the allusion in their new name to the Cubism of Braque, Picasso, and Apollinaire.

As a matter of fact, as in the case of Italian Futurism, the Moscow group included not only men of letters but also artists, and, frequently, men of letters who were also artists. Almost all of the Burljuk brothers, David, Nikolaj, and Vladimir, led by David, the oldest (born in 1882), were poets and painters at the same time. Painters like Lavrënov and Gončarova, sculptors like Lipschitz, were connected with the group. For a while, one of the members of the circle was a man of the theatre, Nikolaj Evreinov, who later was to become well known for his doctrine of "the theatricality of life," and as the author of a few plays anticipating the dramas of Pirandello. The movement had its adventurers, too, like the poet Vasilij Kamenskij, who was one of the first Russians to try to fly an airplane. But Russian Futurism was not merely a meeting ground for eccentrics: it was also a breeding ground of new talents, as shown by the presence in its ranks of two real masters, Xlebnikov and Majakovskij, and of a few minor but authentic craftsmen of the word, like the woman poet, Elena Guro, whose early death (1913) prevented her from developing her promising gifts shown in the posthumous collection of verse, Organ Grinder (Šarmanka, 1914), which is but the poetic report of her child's life and death.

Naturally, the activity of the movement expressed itself, even more than in works of art, in printed proclamations and in public manifestations, even in public scandals: above all, in the irregular but constant publication of a series of arbitrary and challenging anthologies, collecting the best of the minor members of the movement and often some of the most interesting pieces left by Xlebnikov, the most finished literary artist produced by early Russian Futurism. The titles of these collections are highly significant of the paradoxical taste of the group: Hatchery of Judges (Sadok Sudej, I and II, 1909 and 1913); A Slap to Public Taste (Poščečina obščestvennomu vkusu, 1912); Three (Troe); The Roaring Parnassus (Rykajuščij Parnass, 1914); The Marsians' Trumpet (Truba Marsian, 1916); etc. Even a cursory reading of these anthologies shows how Russian Futurism was, theoretically and technically, less superficial than its Italian equivalent: far more interested in

problems of language and style, in questions of versification and form. The elaboration of a Futurist poetics was primarily due to Velemir Xlebnikov, who contributed to it both brilliant insights and interesting experiments; to Aleksandr Kručënyx, born in 1886 and still living in Russia, whose contribution was more valuable in the theoretical than in the practical field; and finally, to David Burljuk, the real organizer of the movement during its heroic years and its outstanding propagandist, who hardly survived as an artist after he left Russia in the early twenties to settle in New York.

This theoretical interest was a peculiar trait of the early Futurist circle, so well represented by the figure of its leader, Velemir Xlebnikov; while the new group, more political and practical, found its standard-bearer in Majakovskij, followed by a host of young poets, the best known of whom is Nikolaj Aseev, who had been also the last to join the Moscow Futurists. Majakovskij himself had foreseen such a metamorphosis of Russian Futurism from the very beginning of the First World War, in the article "A Drop of Tar" (Kaplja degtja), published in the collection Vzjal (1915), the title of which is the third person of the past tense of the Russian verb meaning "to clutch" or "to grasp." That piece contained a double foreboding, announcing the imminent and parallel triumph of the Revolution and of Futurism, and prophesying that the latter would soon "clutch Russia in its grasp." After the war and the Revolution, Majakovskij was destined to lead the Neo-Futurists to their early and uncertain victories, gained through the campaigns he waged as editor-in-chief of the periodical The Left Front of the Arts (Lef, an abbreviation of Levy front isskustv, 1923-28), and through which he hoped to obtain for his movement a kind of cultural monopoly from the Soviet regime. At the same time, Majakovskij helped to make the movement more normal and more popular, succeeded for a while in keeping it in a state of uneasy balance between the taste of the public and the demands of the party line; did his best to defend his own brand of Futurism from the attacks against it from the opposite quarters of the cultural Right and the political Left. When he began to lose his control over the movement, he founded The New Lev (Novy lef, 1927-28), which he described as being "to the left of Lef"; but finally, shortly before his death, confronted with the

hard facts of Soviet reality, he was practically forced to dissolve the movement to which he had given the best years of his life.

It is only for the single poetic achievement of Majakovskij, and for the psychic bond that existed for a while between his inspiration and the new state of mind, enthusiastic and heroic, which dominated Russian youth during the early phase of the Revolution, that the second period of Russian Futurism is more important than the first. But as seekers after new forms and techniques, as pioneers in yet unexplored esthetic fields, thanks to Xlebnikov's searching and tireless quest, the Futurists of the Old Guard left a far deeper imprint in the soil of Russian letters. Yet the two generations of Russian Futurism differed equally from the Italian Futurists by being more aggressive toward the literary situation of the present than toward the national tradition itself; while, on the other hand, their exaltation of modern life was less subordinated than that of their Western rivals to what the latter called "the esthetics of the machine." In the Russian case, the glorification of the values of our modern mechanical civilization came only later, with Majakovskij and his group, and in connection with the Communist idolatry of technology and industrialization.

According to the letter of their statements, and sometimes even according to the spirit of their acts, the Russian Futurists, who from their very beginnings had been sympathetic to the ideal of a social revolution and who had never been dominated by an egotistical and tyrannical leader like Marinetti, were less individualistic than their Italian colleagues, and acted with more consistency and discipline as a group. They steadfastly opposed any decadent culte du moi, stating in the very first of their manifestoes that they would "stand fast on the rock of the word 'we' amidst an ocean of hisses and indignation." As a matter of fact this distrust of any form of self-idolatry by the artist was perhaps the most important of the many differences which led them to sever their ties with the poets of the Petersburg circle, who had significantly labelled themselves Ego-Futurists.

The Ego-Futurists were interested only in disguising old feelings and moods under new dresses or masks, but the Cubo-Futurists were really interested in creating new forms. While the posthumous example of Mallarmé's Coup

de D  s had suggested to Marinetti the doctrine, which remained little more than a slogan, of mots en libert  , the Russian Futurists developed, instead, from some of the ideas and the works of one of the extreme representatives of Russian Symbolism, Andrej Belyj, the theory and practice of a complete metamorphosis of poetic language, and tried to enact a radical revolution of the word. In this attempt they went further than any other offshoot directly derived from Futurism, and anticipated experiments later performed by the Dadaists. They failed in their search, yet they had the merit of pushing it to its extreme consequences, without being satisfied with the wishful or boastful proclamations of unrealized programs.

After all, Marinetti's doctrine of mots en libert  , while proclaiming the dissolution of all syntactical ties, had merely achieved the abolition of punctuation, and had done little more than develop minor and purely external or material effects, like onomatopoeia and typographical relief. The left wing of Russian Futurism—in brief, the Cubo-Futurists—aimed instead at creating a new kind of poetry, based on a language invented anew, consciously constructed for this very purpose. Their intent was to transcend the traditional and conventional meaning of each word; nay, to devise words morphologically new, and therefore devoid of any pre-established connotation. The language thus created took the name of "transmental tongue" (zaumnyj jazyk). Kru   nyx once stated the theory of "transmental" poetry with the following words: "Before us no art of the word ever existed. Up to now it has been maintained that it is poetry that rules the word, rather than contrariwise. We have bared this mistake.... A word is wider than its meaning.... Each letter, each sound, has its relevance.... Why not renounce ideas, why not write with idea-words, with words freely made?... There is no need for such intermediaries as symbol and thought, and we prefer uttering our truth anew ..."

Klebnikov's method was more original and complex, and his poetic experiments cannot be reduced merely to arbitrary exercises in the medium of the "transmental tongue." We can therefore safely assert that the only poet of some reputation among the few using the new medium was Kru   nyx. His "transmental" poems are generally made of newly coined monosyllabic words, joined together

in series or lines based on the associative power of phonetic suggestions or of etymological allusions; the content, if any, of these poems is betrayed, or hinted at, only by their titles. These pieces are among the very few poems of early Futurism belonging to the metrical experiment of vers libre; moreover, they are unrhymed, while a casual and unconventional kind of rhyme will reappear in Majakovskij's free verse. Except for this formal aspect, and against the best intention of its authors, Russian "transmental" poetry ends, however, by achieving effects similar to those produced by nonsense verse. This does not mean that Kručënyx's attempts, or that the less literal performances of Xlebnikov, are devoid of value or interest.

Despite the strong polemical attitude which Futurism took against Symbolism, it is evident that "transmental" poetry is directly related to some extreme Symbolistic trends, and similar in nature to some of the experiments which were undertaken at the end of his life by such a Western master as Mallarmé. Both the suggestive verbalism of the Symbolists and the sensuous verbalism of the Decadents, with their emphatic cult of a musical language, were bound to open the way to developments in the directions mentioned above. Furthermore, some of Kručënyx's ideas seem to anticipate even the doctrines of the Surrealists, who, in spite of their protest to the contrary, are but the children or grandchildren of the Symbolists. Kručënyx anticipated, for instance, the very hypotheses on which the Surrealists based their conceptions of "oneiric poetry" and of "automatic poetry" and of "automatic writing," as the following statement may easily show: "Psychic motions and changes of mood may originate strange combinations of letters and words, devoid of any articulate meaning."

Xlebnikov

It would be impossible to find a greater contrast, in tone and in quality, than the one dividing the poetry of Severjanin from the poetry of Xlebnikov. We may go even further, and we can safely assert that the leader of Cubo-Futurism had little in common not only with the vulgar modernism of Severjanin, but with Futurism itself, as it was understood in Italy by Marinetti, and even in Russia by Majakovskij. Yet along with Majakovskij, and even before him,

Xlebnikov was the most important figure which Russian Futurism produced. As for Majakovskij, he acknowledged more than once the merits of Xlebnikov. Immediately after Xlebnikov's death, Majakovskij described him as "the most magnificent and blameless knight in our poetic struggle ... the Columbus of new poetic continents," and later paid many other similar tributes to the memory of that master. Even writers of very different literary and political tastes qualified their critical reservations with an unbounded admiration for the originality and integrity of the work of Xlebnikov. "Several of his lines," said the Neo-Parnassian and counter-revolutionary Nikolaj Gumilëv, "seem like the fragments of an unwritten epic." Yet Xlebnikov is practically forgotten in Russia and still unknown in the West.

Viktor Vladimirovich Xlebnikov, who chose as nom de plume the Russian and pagan name of Velemir, was born in 1885, in a little town of the province of Astrakhan. He spent his youth in Simbirsk, and studied at the University of Kazan. When he was twenty-three, he went to Petersburg, and began writing his first poems, under the influence of the Symbolists and other older poets of that time. It is quite significant that he was affected especially by the "Byzantinism" of Vjačeslav Ivanov and the "mythologism" of Sergej Gorodetskij. Later he settled in Moscow, where, together with the Burljuk brothers, Majakovskij, and Kručënyx, he founded the Futurist movement in Russia. He contributed to all manifestoes, and helped to edit all the publications of the movement. He collaborated with Kručënyx in framing the doctrine of the "transmental language," of a poetry to be written only in newly coined and meaningless words.

Drafted into the army during the First World War, he deserted after the Revolution, and the civil war caught him in Kharkov. There he met Aseev and published with him the almanac The Marsians' Trumpet. He became a member of the Communist Party, and served the new regime in the Ukraine, in the Caucasus, and in Iran. He saw in the Revolution a messianic Utopia, and it is doubtful whether he would have remained a faithful follower of the party line and the Stalinist order. He died suddenly in the summer of 1922, in a provincial hospital. He left an important, but uneven, body of work, scattered in pamphlets, leaflets, periodicals, and anthologies, which remained practically

inaccessible for about twenty years: a neglect partly due to the official mistrust for experimental art and advance-guard poetry. The most important titles published in his lifetime are Creations (Tvorenija) and Golden Book (Izbornik), both of 1914; Night in a Trench (Noč' v okope) and Zangezi, of 1921 and 1922.

In spite of its label, the poetry of Xlebnikov is not Futuristic in the literal sense of the word. This is equally true from the standpoint of ideas and feelings, as well as from the standpoint of form and technique. Xlebnikov looked at modern life with a sense of aversion; he worked hard at his experiments and research, while the other Futurists were often satisfied with announcing the most radical innovations in resounding manifestoes, or in rhetorical proclamations. Xlebnikov's indifference toward modern themes, toward the most attractive or repulsive aspects of contemporary existence, is proved by contrast by his deep interest in Slavic mythological lore, which inspired several of his poems; or more generally, by his longing for all those forms of primordial or ancestral life which are the field of study of the archeologist and the anthropologist.

In Xlebnikov's work there breathes a kind of pantheistic inspiration à la Walt Whitman, but his is an escape pantheism, out of tune with the present, going backward into the past, and trying to find the regained paradise of primitive innocence in the darkness of prehistory. Also from this viewpoint his poetry has little to do with the movement to which he gave his allegiance. One could say that Futurism was in Russia the last and most extreme literary manifestation of the Westernizing tendency, while in the West it was nothing else but an unconscious variation of the Nineteenth Century idea of progress, from which it derived the myth symbolized by the very term "Futurism." But Xlebnikov is perhaps one of the most consistent Slavophiles in the history of Russian poetry: he even anticipates the reactionary ideology, built after the Revolution by a group of émigré historians and geographers, on the belief that Russia and Siberia are an ethnographical and geopolitical unit, forming the sixth continent of Eurasia. Xlebnikov's Utopia is regressive and retrospective: it repudiates our own steel or iron age for a mythical age of gold, even for a stone or wooden age.

Xlebnikov's sentiment and imagination constantly turn

back toward the time when the forests and plains of European and Asiatic Russia were still inhabited by the spirits of the trees and the waters. Such a nostalgia is expressed by a poem entitled "The Shaman and Venus" (*Šaman i Venera*), which combines barbaric and classical mythology, and where the goddess of love offers herself not to a hero or demigod, but to a Mongol, to a Siberian sorcerer. And Xlebnikov's repudiation of modern life is tragically stated in the poem "The Crane" (*Žuravlej*), where the machines created and enslaved by man rebel against him, as a traitor to nature and to himself.

It would be wrong to interpret too literally the numerous poems which Xlebnikov devoted to historical subjects; their themes are never ends in themselves, but rather media through which the poet turns our attention toward what is archaic and prehistoric in life and man. Such an effect is generally contrived by employing anachronisms, because, as we read in one of the poet's tales, "there are no barriers within time . . . consciousness joins together the different ages . . ." These violations of chronology, this conversion into new values of the category of time, are applied by Xlebnikov not only to the collective experience of mankind, but to the individual himself. Thus, in the story "The World Upside Down" (*Mir izkonca*), the biography of the protagonist is reversed, and the author accompanies him from his grave to his cradle.

As shown by the judgment of Gumil'ev, quoted above, the anonymous, almost choral solemnity of Xlebnikov's poetry has led a few critics to assert the epical character of his inspiration. But in the poet's imagination the mythical element is stronger than the heroic one: his conception of nature as in a state of permanent chaos, as a continuation of the first day of creation, as an everlasting conflict between the human and the cosmic, between creatures that are like things and things that are like creatures, suggests, rather than the epical, the theogonic character of his inspiration. This can be easily recognized also in the poems which Xlebnikov wrote under the impact of the War and the Revolution. Except for a few pieces dictated in the spirit of the future "Left Marches" of Majakovskij, all these poems look at those two historical events as if they were cosmical catastrophes, elementary cataclysms. The military and revolutionary struggle is seen as a new Titanomachy, as a

conflict between upper and nether gods, as the eternal warfare between the animistic forces of the universe. History, again, is reduced to prehistory; war, to a telluric outburst; the Revolution, to a metamorphosis. The tragical breath of the gods of destruction and death transforms the cosmos into chaos, and earth into a Gehenna.

Sometimes Xlebnikov seems to conceive of revolution as a palingenesis or rebirth, as in the poem "Liberty for All" (*Svoboda dlja vsej*); but even here, significantly enough, he asks for the resurrection of the natural deities of the primitive mythology of the Slavs. In "Death Feast" (*Trizna*), he describes the burning of the corpses on a modern battlefield as if it were an ancient ritual, an archaic funeral pyre, while the uncontrolled forces of nature, symbolized by two great Russian rivers, are considered as more powerful than that fire which man has learned to use and to control. Thus in Xlebnikov's poetry the fragile order of man is forever upset by the revolt of the elements. This can be seen in the beautiful passage of a poem describing a fusillade in the dark streets of a city, in the autumn or early winter of 1917. We do not see the people who are killing, but only those who are being killed, and we hear only the voice of the guns. The shots themselves, rather than being a man-made curse, are a wind of fire, a rain of lead. The bullets are like cruel spirits generated by the obscure recesses of the material world. Human beings are either their blind victims or their blind instruments, never their conscious agents. The very act of slaughter is described as the cutting down of a poplar tree's branches and trunk.

Nothing is more significant than this identification of war and murder with the falling of leaves, with the felling of a tree: in brief, with autumn and winter. Here Xlebnikov shows once more his tendency to translate the events of human history into the phenomena of natural history, to interchange epochs and seasons, to introduce within the microcosm the laws and proportions of the macrocosm. The same tendencies, and the methods mentioned above, the same processes of indifferenciation and anachronism, the same attempt to establish metaphysical and metahistorical categories, are to be found also in his linguistic revolution, in his verbal reform. In this too, he remains independent from the mainstream of the literary movement to which he belongs. While the average Futurist starts from the

traditional vocabulary to create his own paradoxical words, and from conventional grammar to his final denial of syntactic structure, Xlebnikov looks in the storehouse of popular and national speech in order to find ancient and eternal roots, and to rebuild a new tongue on the ideal chain of pure forms and perfect words. The neologisms and barbarisms so frequent in normal Futurist idiom are replaced in this poet's work by archaisms and Slavisms, and his writing seems to be the literal execution of the poet's task as defined by Mallarmé: donner un sens plus pur aux mots de la tribu.

As a philologist, Xlebnikov is especially interested in the archaic stage of the linguistic evolution. It is there that he tries to find the embryo or the shell, the secret of the genesis of language, or even of creation itself, since "in the beginning was the Word." He states his purpose in the following terms: "Without breaking the links of the roots, to find the philosopher's stone of the reciprocal interchange of all Slavic words, freely dissolving them into each other: such is my conception of the word. The Word per se, outside of life, and beyond its vital uses." This ideal of the poetic word as an entity completely divorced from history and culture, this reversal of the idea of language as a token conventionally accepted and exchanged by man, are conceptions that may be found also in Mallarmé, although it is quite probable that Xlebnikov was unaware of the relationship.

The poet tried to put into practice the notions of the theorist, and made several experiments in that direction. Such is the case with a poem like "Curse by Laughter" (Zakljatie smexom), which attempts to achieve a kind of lyrical catharsis of an etymological unit. In this poem, where one does not find even one of the forms of the verb "to be," all words are without exception derived from the Russian and Slavic root meaning "to laugh." This root is used in all its existing forms or possible variants: nouns and verbs, adjectives and adverbs, cases and aspects, tenses and moods, derivatives and compounds; and also in new words convincingly invented by the poet with the aid of several prefixes and suffixes. Because of this reduction of the poem to only one word-idea, the experiment from the linguistic standpoint has an exclusively phonetic and morphological character. As a work of art, it aims successfully at

achieving a poetic equivalent of that kind of musical composition called "theme with variations."

These linguistic and experimental interests relate Xlebnikov's work to the critical theories of the Formalist school. But the poet, besides being a born philologist, was also an arbitrary and mystical one, as it has been the case with some of the Symbolists. He was obsessed by the ancient myth of the universal tongue, of an adamic or edenic language, which he dreamed of reaching again through methods reminiscent of those employed by the French René Ghil. Valerij Brjusov had been the only one in Russia to pay some attention to René Ghil and his "scientific poetry," which, rather than scientific, was cabalistic. Belyj had moved in the same direction, bringing to extreme mystical consequence, in his Glossolaliija, the symbolistic doctrine of the "syncretism of the arts." Xlebnikov stated his position with the following words, in the text already quoted above: "After having realized that the roots are but ghosts hiding the alphabet's strings, to find the universal identity of all tongues: this is my second conception of the word."

It is evident that by letters of the alphabet Xlebnikov meant not only the sounds, but also the signs representing them; like Belyj, he wanted not only to speak or sing, but also "to paint with words." This led him to experimenting not only with merely verbal, but also with non-verbal signs: his research in the field of general symbolism is a poetic anticipation of modern semantics. His early verbal exercises had been a clever manipulation of the doctrine of the "transmental language," as shown by the predominance of onomatopoeic effects. But while we have been led to compare the compositions of other "transmental" poets to a kind of nonsense verse, we must say that these experiments by Xlebnikov are charged, even overcharged, with meanings of every sort, not merely verbal, but graphic, and ideographic, too. They are dominated by a system of allusions, where there appear also, like hieroglyphics, historical references, and iconic symbols. Yet, even these are reduced to the common denominator of linguistic structure, playing at the same time the roles of grammatical functions, as well as of myths.

Thus, in the poem without title, beginning with the line "Villa by night. Genghis Khan!" (Usad'ba noch'ju. Čingisxan!), a series of proper names belonging to the cultural

or historical tradition are used as appositions or attributes describing or qualifying some aspects or elements of a landscape. This is why they are not capitalized. If, for instance, the "villa by night" is genghis khan, the nocturne itself is zarathustra, and the dark-blue sky, mozart. The strangeness and arbitrariness of these methods may be equally approved or reproved, and their importance may be too easily overrated. But we must not stop at the technical details per se. What counts is that by means of a given device the poet has shown us an insight into a world of his own, where human reality and historical events become qualities of things, where life and history are lowered, or raised, to the condition of nature itself. It is for visions of this kind, not only for his daring use of language, that the poet Klebnikov, far more than Andrej Belyj, whose novels have been so often compared to Ulysses, reminds us of Joyce and of his creation, especially of Finnegans Wake.

Esenin

Unlike Majakovskij, whose destiny it was to become the poet of history and of "October," Sergej Esenin remained forever the poet of nature and of the decaying season, as if fated by his own family name, derived from a Slavic root meaning "autumn." Yet for a while he, too, wanted to be, like Majakovskij, the poet of the new era. But the man who in Inonija defined himself as "the prophet Sergej Esenin," projected into the image of the Revolution hopes and fears undreamed of by his rival. Majakovskij had learned his craft from early Futurism, which we have already described as the most extreme manifestation of the Westernizing tendency in Russian literature; and his political ideology derived from the workers' movement and Marxism. This orientation, as well as his temperament, had made of him an urban poet, the singer of the metropolis, the glorifier of city life. Esenin, instead, had begun his literary career as a pupil of the peasant poet Nikolaj Kljuev. He easily surpassed, in artistry as well as in inspiration, the modest achievements of his master; yet he constantly hesitated between the contrasting attractions of the modernistic trends and of the traditions of folk poetry. At the end of his career he felt that he had failed to reconcile within himself the old and the new, as shown by his

famous complaint: "I am the last peasant poet: crude is the wooden bridge of my songs."

So, while Majakovskij accepted, almost beyond his will, the task of singing the "edification of Socialism," Esenin remained always the poet of "wooden and vegetable Russia." Politically, he had always felt closer to the Social-Revolutionary Party, an offshoot of the Populist movement, which interpreted in radical terms the messianic view of an agrarian Russia, thus acting as an unconscious Slavophilism of the Left. While the Marxists exalted the working class, the Social-Revolutionaries idolized the peasantry, in which they saw the whole of Russia. Besides being affected by this political ideology, Esenin had been subjected from his childhood to the eschatological mysticism still alive in the countryside among the sectarian groups which had left the mother Church at the time of the great Dissent. It was this combination of doctrines and beliefs that led the poet to see at first in the Revolution both a new Zion and a modern Arcadia, bringing Christian peace, pastoral happiness, and utopian justice to the men of good will, who were the toilers of the earth.

To be exact, except for the accident of his birth, Esenin never belonged to the tillers of the soil. Yet, in a moral sense, he remained until his death a child of the Russian countryside. He was born in 1895 in the village of Konstantinovo, in the province of Ryazan. The father and mother of the future poet had gone to work in Moscow, and the boy was raised by his maternal grandparents, who were prosperous farmers, and who instilled in him a love for the old faith and the simple legends of the Russian people. He started studying to become a country teacher, but while at school, through the reading of Puškin, the mysterious magic of poetry was revealed to him. He joined his father in Moscow, where, among other jobs, he worked in a bookshop and at a printing press, dreaming of a literary career, and writing his first poems. In 1924, he settled in Petrograd, where he became a protégé of Sergej Gorodetskij, a rather artificial poet who had found his Muse in the mythology of pagan Russia. There he also met Kljuev, with whom he led for a while a group of poets of peasant origins. In 1916 he published his first collection of poems, to which he gave, as to many other of his books and works, a title so

peculiarly Slavonic as to be practically untranslatable:
Radunica.

Shortly after, he was drafted into the army, but served in the Russian Versailles, the "Imperial Village" of Tsarskoe Selo, celebrated by the early Puškin. By then his name was already well known; it is reported that he was once invited to read his poems to the Empress, although it seems that he declined the invitation. At that time he fell under the influence of the radical critic, R. I. Ivanov-Razumnik, a Social-Revolutionary with Bolshevik sympathies, who was shaping a mystical and apocalyptic doctrine about the destiny of the Russian people, under the name of "Scythianism." It was perhaps because of his Leftist leanings that in 1917 the poet was sent to the front, where he was surprised by the Revolution. Like millions of other Russian soldiers, he deserted and returned home, settling later in Petrograd, where he married Zinaida Rič, and published the poems he had written under the spell of Ivanov-Razumnik's "Scythianism," Inonija (1918) and Transfiguration (Preobraženie, 1919.)

Later on, in Moscow, he tried to show his independence not only from Kljuev, but also from even the brightest stars of the Russian poetic firmament, such as Blok and Majakovskij, by founding, along with other younger writers, the movement called Imaginism. It was then and there that he started his vie de bohême, leading a life of orgies and scandals. Once, with other members of his group, Esenin spent a night in jail: the poet and his companions had been arrested while painting their names on the signposts of the main thoroughfares of the capital. The psychological experiences of those years were to be forcefully conveyed in the poems of A Hooligan's Confession (Ispoved' xuligana), published in 1921 (the title piece had already appeared in 1918); and in the cycle entitled Moscow of the Taverns (Kabatskaja Moskva, 1922). The experimental techniques of Imaginism found peculiar expression in the lyrics of Tre-rjadnica and in the dramatic poem Pugačëv (1921).

It was in 1921 that Sergej Esenin first met the famous American classical dancer, Isadora Duncan, who by then had already reached middle age. They became lovers, and married in 1922. Unable to speak each other's tongue, they found a common experience in high living and heavy

drinking. Impoverished by her lavish style of living, Isadora Duncan decided to make a tournee abroad, and Sergej accompanied her in a long journey through Western Europe and the United States. It was a shabby odyssey, full of misadventures and failures. Esenin felt cruelly disappointed in the West and drowned his despair in alcohol. When he returned to Russia, his mental and physical health was fatally impaired. He broke with Miss Duncan, and married in 1925 a descendant of Lev Tolstoj; she nursed him, and after his death became the custodian of his literary heritage, and the vestal of his memory. Fearing that his creative powers were forever gone, on December 27, 1925, he hanged himself in a Leningrad hotel room. The night before, since there was no ink in his desk, he slightly cut a vein in his wrist, and wrote with his blood a brief farewell poem, ending with the famous lines: "to die is not new, but to live is not newer." Majakovskij answered these lines with a poem condemning Esenin's act, not knowing that within five years he would come to the same willful end.

In the poetry of Esenin there is at least a minor vein which is not too different from certain aspects of Majakovskij's work. This is the apocalyptic strain, which appears in Transfiguration and Inonija (the latter is a word coined by the poet, meaning "Other-Land"). In both pieces the poet condemns the dying old world, while exalting the Revolution as a kind of cosmic rebirth. Here Esenin's verse, like Majakovskij's, overflows with "hyperbolic" and "iconoclastic" images which in this case derive however from a morbid and perverted mysticism, often turning into heresy and blasphemy, into a parody of Christian hopes, myths, and beliefs. In these two poems Esenin becomes the secular apostle of a new Gospel, the announcer of a new earthly kingdom, the seer of the Revolution as the earthly paradise of the peasant and the shepherd. These two pieces greatly differ from the long poems of the later years, predominantly autobiographical in character, and expressing the disappointment of the poet with the Revolution, as well as the complaint of a peasant's son uprooted from the countryside, living as an outcast in the alien world of the city.

Both the early revolutionary pieces, which are the weakest part of his work, and the later autobiographical poems may all too often seem to a foreign reader the most important fruits of this poet's talent. Certainly, nobody

can deny their significance as human and social documents. Yet the most genuine of Esenin's masterpieces are to be found among his shortest and less ambitious lyrics, written in the pure and simple modes of the elegy and the idyll, devoid of any rhetorical and anecdotal structure, and lightly woven as a cobweb of transparent words around the cluster of a few bright and striking images. Each one of these songs may be reduced to a landscape and to the mood it evokes within the soul of the poet. Although the narrative element is lacking, or hardly present, the poems partake of the magic aura of the legend and the fairy tale. They recreate a private and intimate universe, domestic and rustic, where all things are humanized by a naive animism, by a pathetic anthropomorphism. The ingenuousness of Esenin's vision is evident in the central image of each one of such poems, defining its object by a kind of childish puzzle that follows or accompanies its name.

It is from the same simplicity of outlook that Esenin derives his gusto for the colorful, the vivid, the picturesque. His favorite color is the color of the sky, in all its shades, and he loves it so much as to attribute it to his native land, to his "blue Russia." But his poems are equally full of white and yellow patches, so enameled as to give the effect of gold and silver, and to remind us of icon and miniature painting, of Byzantine mosaics and of popular prints or cuts. This chromatism is not merely a decorative, but rather a compositional element, and intensifies the stylization of the poet's vision, so evident in the stillness of the landscapes, with their motionless figures and timeless moods. But almost always this stillness is broken by a sudden burst of song, by a hidden stream of music, changing the stasis into ecstasy, and flooding the entire scene with a melodic grief which makes a vibrant chord of every fiber.

This feeling of cosmic pain is suggested through a continuous parallelism, through a continuous identification between men, beasts, plants, and stars. For Esenin there is no difference between our tears, and the tears of all other creatures, and even of things. Since only the humble may be exalted, the poet celebrates even the heavenly creature he loves most, the moon, through a series of animal metamorphoses: by converting it, metaphorically, now into a bear, now into a frog. In the same spirit, when

wishing to express his own sorrow at the passing of time, he changes himself into an old maple; or when wishing to declare his love for a girl, he addresses instead a young birch.

It is the beasts that play a central role in the poet's belief that there exists a universal, brotherly and mystical bond, joining together the human and the non-human, the animal and vegetable kingdoms, the organic and inorganic worlds. Animals are for Esenin the most human and humane of all the creatures of God. Thus, in one of the most beautiful and moving poems of his later years, he projects the horror of the Revolution through the vision of animal, rather than human, slaughter: through the ordeal of starvation and famine, when human beings are forced to kill their domestic animals, and to eat of their flesh. Such a poem is Mare Ships, in which the tragedy of Revolution is reduced to the tragedy of hunger, symbolized by carrion abandoned in a city street.

As the poet of wooden Russia, Esenin also protested against the invasion of the Russian countryside by the technological monsters of modern civilization: by the telegraph poles and the electric cables, the steam engines and steel derricks later demanded by the Five-Year Plans. This theme is fully developed in Requiem, especially in its final scene, describing a foolish colt that vainly challenges to a race the train crossing the Russian plains as a ghostly and awful "iron guest." The two themes of the animal's sacrifice and of the countryside's martyrdom dominate the poetry of the late Esenin, in which they merge with a more individual note, with the poet's lament about his plight as a man and an artist. The poet's plaint about his own crisis, and the foreboding of his own ruin, reflect in personal terms the cruel destiny of any uprooted villager, living as an exile in the foreign and harsh world of the city. The peasant's son had become a successful writer, even a public figure; yet he remained forever obsessed by a sense of failure and guilt. The disease of modern life had tainted his body and his soul, and there was nothing that could cure him. Esenin conveyed this feeling of alienation and corruption in Soviet Russia, a poem describing a visit to his native village; he vented his indignation against a way of life he could neither reject nor accept, by acting, in both imagination and reality, as the bohemian and a hooligan, as an eccentric and an outcast.

As we know, he also sought escape in the artificial paradise of alcohol, into the hell of "firewater": and this is the main motif of Moscow of the Taverns. Yet the only way out he could find was self-inflicted death, and the double misery of his brief existence and of his violent end proves the truth of his statement that "the poet came on earth to understand everything, but to take nothing." The lesson we may learn from his fate, as from the fate of Majakovskij, is that in no country is the advance-guard artist so threatened with extinction as in the land that claims to play on the stage of history the role of mankind's advance-guard. That death of art which Hegel once prophesied is now taking place not within the borders of bourgeois culture, but beyond them.

Note

1. [Here are printed three sections of "The Russian Literary Advance-Guards, 1910-1930," Chapter VII of Professor Poggioli's forthcoming book, The Poets of Russia, 1890-1930, to be published by Harvard University Press.—Editor's note.]

RUSSIAN ÉMIGRÉ SCHOLARS IN PRAGUE AFTER WORLD WAR I

By T. Riha

University of California (Berkeley)

Speaking on the occasion of President Masaryk's death in 1937, Paul N. Miliukov said: "No country made such sacrifices for the good of the Russian emigration as Czechoslovakia."¹ Twenty years later many living and prominent émigrés could testify to the imaginative help extended to them by a little Slavic country that had not even existed when they embarked on their careers in Imperial Russia. Such scholars as Alexander Baykov, Dmitry Čiževsky, Georges Florovsky, Roman Jakobson, Nicholas Lossky, Marc Slonim, Pitirim Sorokin, Nicholas Timasheff, George Vernadsky, and Vasilij Zenkovsky lived and worked in Czechoslovakia, some for the entire interwar period, and even through World War II. Their names indicate the character of the group that Masaryk and Beneš and their country chose to support, out of their limited resources.

Czechoslovakia never had a large Russian colony. But Prague was the scholarly center of the emigration throughout the twenties. Students and scholars formed the majority of the émigrés in Prague. As it has been noted, "The life of Russians in Prague had a different character from the life of Russian émigrés elsewhere: here almost all of them studies, taught, or engaged in writing and research."² In 1924 the Czechoslovak government supported over four thousand émigré students, and some two hundred professors and research workers.³

How had this come about? In 1921 a group of Paris émigrés organized a Congress of Russian Scholars and Academic Organizations Abroad. At the invitation of Dr. Edvard Beneš, then foreign minister of Czechoslovakia, the Congress took place in Prague in October of that year. There followed the formulation of a Czechoslovak governmental plan entitled appropriately "Action Russe," which

was the country's answer to both the short- and the long-range needs of the emigration.

This was a bold and constructive undertaking financed by the Czechoslovak parliament and administered by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. One of its chief aims was the training of émigré students by Russian scholars in Russian schools to be established in Prague. Students were provided with stipends adequate for their support, while professors were paid on the same scale as their Czechoslovak counterparts. Besides training a new student generation deprived of a home, émigré scholars were encouraged to work on research projects, and valuable publications began to appear. At the end of the twenties, political reasons, as well as the economic crisis, curtailed this fine project. But as late as 1938 some sixty Russian émigré scholars continued to draw modest Czechoslovak government pensions.⁴

After 1921, Russian schools in Prague mushroomed. In addition to two Russian gymnasiums there were established a Law Faculty, a Pedagogical Institute, an Institute of Agricultural Co-operation, a Popular University, and a number of technical schools. Several hundred Russian students, also on government stipends, studied at various Czech institutions of higher learning, and some twenty Russian professors became members of Czech university faculties. There arose a number of Russian research institutes, of which the best known were the Kondakov Institute for the study of Russian and Byzantine art, and the Economic Cabinet of Professor Sergej Prokopovič. Some two dozen learned journals of high distinction were published by the emigration in Prague.⁵

A cardinal principle of the "Action Russe" was the belief of both the Czechoslovak government and the emigration that the students trained would soon return to Russia where their newly acquired skills would be much welcomed. For this reason the curriculums of the various émigré schools were those of pre-1917 as modified by the March revolution. Academic degrees granted were intended to establish continuity with the past. There was some justification in this. At the time of its opening in 1922 the Russian Law Faculty in Prague was a unique institution. The Soviets had, for a brief period, closed down all law faculties in Russia.

With the abandonment of the NEP it became obvious

that any mass return of the young emigration was unthinkable. The "Action Russe" suffered a certain moral defeat from which it never recovered. It no longer made sense to train lawyers or agricultural experts for a democratic Russia which could not be resurrected. The very basis of the Czechoslovak plan had to be abandoned. Although an indeterminate number of students continued to trickle back to Russia, the bulk of the young émigrés now planned their future with an eye on the possibilities outside of Russia.

In the heyday of the "Action Russe" all a young Russian needed was a desire to study; the government and the academic community would take care of the rest, provided that he was intellectually qualified. He had a choice of many excellent schools. At the Law Faculty (Russkij Juridičeskij Fakul'tet v Prage) he would find an academic staff worthy of any great Russian university. All the traditional chairs were taken by experts in the field. The rector was the famous jurist Paul Novgorodcev, formerly director of the Moscow Commerical Institute. He also taught the history and philosophy of law. Canon law was taught by Professor Sergej Bulgakov, later of the Russian Orthodox Seminary in Paris, assisted by George Vernadsky, now of Yale University. Sergej Zavadskij, formerly a member of the Cassation Department of the Russian Senate, and vice chairman of the Provisional Government's Commission to Investigate Tsarist Leaders, held the chair of civil law. Peter B. Struve taught political economy and edited, from Prague, the briefly resumed Russkaja mysl'. Assisting him was Professor A. N. Anciferov, author of one of the volumes in the Economic and Social History of the World War series undertaken by the Carnegie Endowment. The chair of logic was occupied by Professor Nicholas Lossky, the best-known living Russian philosopher. The Law Faculty was in existence between 1922 and 1928, when the large government subsidy was discontinued.⁶

If the émigré student was interested in history, he could work with any one of two dozen émigré historians, many of whom had been leading specialists in Russia. The best beloved of these was Aleksandr Kizevetter, one of the group of scholars banished by the Bolsheviks in 1922. Perhaps the best-known abroad was the Byzantologist and Academician Nikodim P. Kondakov. His splendid book on the Russian icon was published by the Czechoslovak government

to honor his eightieth birthday in 1924.⁷ An institute named after him continued to work after his death with a government subsidy in Prague, later in Belgrade, until the outbreak of the World War II.

A number of émigré historians devoted their efforts to areas and topics influenced by their stay in Czechoslovakia. Thus the history of Subcarpathian Ukraine found its most devoted student in the person of Professor Aleksej L. Petrov, who wrote the basic works in the field. Another topic was the history of Russo-Bohemian relations which was most competently covered by Anton Florovskij. He is still professor of Russian history at Charles University in Prague. After 1945 he, like very few other émigrés, successfully negotiated the great transition between émigré status and Soviet citizenship, and toleration.⁸

A new use was made of valuable Russian documents scattered throughout the libraries and archives, both public and private, of Czechoslovakia. Young scholars such as Boris A. Evreinov and Nikolaj A. Elenev worked with nineteenth-century documents concerning the visits of Emperors Alexander I and Nicholas I to Bohemia. The Russian collections of Prague libraries were outstanding by any standard; a particularly well-known repository, founded and staffed by the emigration and supported by government funds, was the Russian Archive in Prague (Russkij Istoričeskij Arxiv v Praze). A recent article⁹ has described its fate after the Soviet occupation of Prague. Robbed of its rich manuscript resources, it nevertheless remains perhaps the most obvious sign of the emigration's interlude in Prague. It still employs several émigré scholars under Aleksandr F. Izjumov.

In 1928, at the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the founding of Czechoslovakia, the émigrés published a work describing their life in Prague.¹⁰ This little book is a memorial to a Russian colony, which, at its height, was described as "the liveliest center of the Russian emigration".¹¹ It seems in retrospect, after the passing of one generation and a cataclysmic new war, that the great émigré problem has never been handled more intelligently and constructively than in those hopeful twenties by a little country in the heart of Europe.

Notes

1. Paul N. Miliukov, Pamjati T. G. Masaryka (Prague: Ob"edinenie Russkix Emigrantskix Organizacii v Čexoslovakii, 1937), p. 21.
2. D. Meisner, "O russkix," Poslednija novosti (Paris), Dec. 8, 1928.
3. Czechoslovak Republic, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Czechoslovak Help to the Russian and Ukrainian Emigration (Prague: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1924), pp. 9, 12-13. I am not concerned here with government funds spent for the support of groups among the emigration other than students and scholars.
4. Sir John Hope Simpson, The Refugee Problem (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 387.
5. Institut po izučeníju istorii i kul'tury SSSR, Munich, Ukazatel' periodičeskix izdanij emigracii iz Rossii i SSSR za 1919-52 gg. (Munich: Institut, 1953), *passim*.
6. Russkij Juridičeskij Fakul'tet v Prage, Otčet o dejatel'nosti (Prague: Izd. Fakul'teta, 1924), *passim*.
7. Nikodim Pavlovič Kondakov, 1844-1924 (Prague: Plamja, 1924), *passim*.
8. Other émigrés fared less well. The Eurasian economist Peter Savickij, who had once taught at the émigré Law Faculty, was deported by the Soviets in 1945. He was sentenced to ten years of hard labor but returned to Prague in 1955, and has continued to reside, teach, and publish there.
9. George Fischer, "The Russian Archive in Prague," American Slavic and East European Review, VIII (1949), 289-295.
10. S. P. Postnikov, ed., Russkie v Prage (Prague: 1928).
11. Aleksandr Kizevetter, in Komitet Russkoj Knigi, Zarubežnaja russkaja kniga (Prague: Plamja, 1924), p. 92.

NE XLEBOM EDINYM: REVISED EDITION

By Tatiana Sklanczenko

Indiana University

No piece of recent Soviet literature has aroused so much controversy in the Soviet Union and interest abroad as Dudincev's novel, Ne xlebom edinyim (Not by Bread Alone), since its publication in Novyj mir, from August to October (Nos. 8-10), 1956. Copies of these numbers of Novyj mir became unobtainable almost immediately. In 1957 two different reprints in book form from the Novyj mir publication appeared, one in Germany and one in the United States.¹ When publication of the novel in English translation was undertaken, there was insistence that the English translation be of a revised text, and there was a suggestion that it would be considered an "unfriendly act" not to include these revisions; however, it was nevertheless decided that the English translation would be of the originally printed text of the novel, and so it appeared.² In the meantime, Dudincev was stalwartly defending the novel against all attacks.³ Now the novel has appeared in book form in a Soviet publication; while Dudincev was vigorously defending his book against revision, it had been signed to the press in revised form.⁴ In view of the violent discussions of Dudincev's book and of his own defense, it is of considerable interest to see what changes have been made in the first revised edition, to discover whether the changes are merely stylistic or whether they are ideological. It will be the purpose of this paper to examine these changes.

The total of the changes amounts to several hundred. They may be classified in four groups: (1) corrections of spelling, (2) lexicological changes, (3) more basic changes of style, and (4) changes in the meaning of certain passages. The first two groups are of comparatively little interest. Instead of itti (NM, viii, 54) we have idti (36);⁵ temnosero-go (NM, viii, 94) is changed to temno-serogo (94), cygarka (NM, x, 55) to cigarka (296), ètak-to (NM, viii, 51) to

ědak-to (32), etc. Somewhat more interesting are lexicological changes, though they are also minor. The main group of these is made up of changes of diminutives to standard forms of nouns, e.g., pidžačok (NM, viii, 115) to pidžak (124), stolik (NM, viii, 58) to stol (42), etc. The word tenniska (NM, viii, 79) is changed to polurukavka (72), possibly to give preference to the Russian form of the word. There is also a considerable number of changes of aspects of verbs, usually from imperfective to perfective.

For more basic stylistic revision, curiously enough, Dudincev shows a tendency to remove "superfluous detail." For example, in the two following instances, the underlined words are removed in the revised edition.

Then he shaved in front of a little round mirror he had propped up on his pillow, dressed again, and went out to wander in the streets and think over his affairs. (NM, viii, 104; 108.)

He glanced significantly at Lopatkin, and propping his elbows on the table, began looking around him and blowing into his fist, showing his childish shoulders. (NM, x, 27; 255.)

Similarly, details of Lopatkin's description of his elegant suit at the end of the novel are omitted (NM, x, 62; 305). The giving of enlivening descriptive detail has been one of the most characteristic features of the whole school of realistic writing; to be sure, omission of them tightens up the novel somewhat, but at the same time, it removes part of the impression of reality.

The most interesting changes are those which, however motivated by stylistic considerations, involve changes of meaning of the novel. There is a considerable number of omissions of passages with regard to the hero, Lopatkin. The largest of these concerns Lopatkin's relationship with women. At the end of the novel, the entire scene of Lopatkin's final meeting with Žanna is omitted, because he "forgot" to go (NM, x, 68; 342); also the scene of Lopatkin's indecision about going to the station to see her off is removed (NM, x, 48; 286). The asceticism of Lopatkin, and his single-minded devotion to his idea is shown by the removal of the entire passage in which Galickij's mother suggests that Lopatkin should become the father of a family

such as Galickij's (NM, x, 68-69; 315-316). Passages having any sentimentality toward Lopatkin are removed: "Perhaps—as they used to write in the old novels—she would want nothing more than 'to kiss those patient hands' that had held a hammer, and schoolmaster's chalk, and a slide rule, and now had taken a hammer up once more" (NM, ix, 40; 133). In the first edition, Lopatkin reflects on the years of his past life, and shows consciousness of getting older (NM, ix, 113), but in the second edition, the author counteracts this momentary softness of his hero by declaring that "... the mighty autumn of nature passed by this man and did not affect him" (239). At another point, a paragraph is added, explaining Lopatkin's inability to lead the quiet, peaceful life because his "sensitive readiness for battle had become a habit" (NM, x, 57; 298). In the first edition, there can be some hesitancy or self-doubt in Lopatkin. In a rather desperate voice he calls: "'I am an ant myself.' Suddenly something broke loose in him... 'But I don't crawl up a birch tree, I drag a caterpillar ten times my own weight into the ant heap.'" (NM, viii, 109.) In the revised edition, we have a self-confident man: "Come down from the tree, you ant!—Suddenly something broke loose in him... —And, better, help me carry the caterpillar to the ant heap, the caterpillar which is at least ten times as heavy as I am!" (115.)

To summarize, in the second edition Lopatkin appears to be much closer to the usual Soviet literary hero, a person without shortcomings or weaknesses, moving with self-assurance directly toward his goals, and totally unwilling to allow anything, even love or family life, to stand in his way. The result is that he resembles a human being even less than in the first edition.

In other ways Dudincev attempts in the revised version to tighten up the novel. Perhaps the most successful of these changes has to do with Nadja Drozdova's role as "co-inventor." Immediately upon her discovery of an article about Bimetallisches Rohr, Lopatkin calls her an "inventor" and states that the "idea of the double-layer pipes is hers" (NM, ix, 110; 234); and he goes further, as "Nadja cautiously criticized certain variants of machines drawn by Lopatkin" (NM, ix, 115; 241). The correction successfully makes the point at once of "co-inventors," but at the same time it makes even more incredible the whole conduct of

Lopatkin's trial on the charge of showing "secrets" with regard to his inventions to her.

There are small, but characteristic changes with regard to other personalities in the novel. Galickij represents the Communist Party in the novel. In the first edition, Galickij, loaded down with work, comments: "Let me tell you: I have some fine guns, yet I put off going out shooting from day to day. I don't know whether this is the right line to take." (NM, ix, 99; 219.) This passage is omitted; a true Party member can have no doubt as to whether anything should interfere with Party business or responsible work. Valentina Pavlovna, another of the women in love with Lopatkin, represents the Komsomol. In the first edition of the novel, it is clearly stated that she left her husband for love of Lopatkin: "No one would have imagined that somewhere she had an unhappy husband who was in love with her and whom she had deserted, taking their daughter with her, because she herself had fallen in love with another man, although this other man was indifferent to her and suspected nothing" (NM, viii, 41). Instead, in the second edition we have: "Nobody would have imagined that since 1942 [i.e., before she met Lopatkin] she had been taking care of her daughter and even still less would anybody believe that this light-hearted laugh could hide a not-very-happy love" (18). Nadja Drozdova, a non-Party woman, can leave her husband for love—itself an unusual thing in Soviet novels—but the Party woman cannot.

In the new version Ganičeva is presented as without her former make-up (NM, ix, 65; 169); the other schoolteachers similarly lose their nail polish (NM, viii, 41; 17). The old inventor Bus'ko's enthusiasm for Balzac's works as "true, great literature" (NM, ix, 74; 182) is removed from the new edition. At the same time, the word "Fomin's"—Bus'ko's expression for his enemies who suppress his inventions—is replaced by the direct word "monopoly" (NM, ix, 39; 131), and "a small group of scientists" (NM, viii, 116) by the "power of monopoly" (126).

There are other important changes at the end of the novel. Lopatkin's isolation as a "single fighter" (NM, x, 97) is removed, but there is a strong suggestion that there are others like him, as the novel adds, "There are more of us now . . ." (355). But perhaps the most interesting omissions in the entire revised version of the novel have to do

with Lopatkin's reminiscences of his experiences during World War II, as he refers to the Party's Combat Regulations and gives a direct suggestion that there will be open warfare between Lopatkin and the entrenched bureaucrats (NM, x, 97; 355). It is particularly interesting that Dudincev removed this passage, for in his defense of his novel, he said, at the same time that the revised novel was going to press;

I remember the early days of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. I was in a trench. A dogfight was going on overhead. Messerschmitts were shooting down our planes, although our planes were superior in numbers. Something snapped in me because I had always been told that our planes were fastest and best.

In summary, it can be seen that Dudincev's changes in the novel were mainly stylistic, with the idea of tightening up the phraseology and in some respects the action of the novel. At the same time, there are relatively important changes, or changes of emphasis or detail, particularly in the single-mindedness of the hero. The changes were designed to improve the novel, from the point of view according to which it was written. Though many of the changes have the effect of bringing the novel closer to the usual Soviet manner of writing, Dudincev did not remove any of the basic criticism of Soviet life which he had included in the first edition, and the changes did not at all satisfy his Soviet critics.

Since this article was written, it has been announced that Dudincev has bowed to the criticism from literary and political figures including Xruščev himself, has "admitted" his "errors" in the novel and has promised to write a new novel "depicting Soviet life in a true light."⁷ His next novel will be awaited with interest.

Notes

1. One edition was published in New York by the Novoye Russkoye Slovo and the other in Munich by the Central'noe Ob"edinenie Političeskix Ėmigrantov.

2. See New York Times, March 3, 1957; Edith Bone's translation of the original version of the novel was published in New York by Dutton and in London by Hutchinson in 1957.

3. See Literaturnaja gazeta, March 19, 1957, pp. 1, 3.

4. A. Dudincev, Ne xlebom edinyim (Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel', 1957). It was signed for the press on March 20, 1957 (see p. 356).

5. Citations in this paper to the two Soviet editions of Dudincev's work will be given as follows: NM, viii, 54, refers to page 54 of No. 8 of Novyj mir for 1956; simple page-number references are to the Sovetskij pisatel' edition.

6. Quoted by Harry Schwartz in "Writing in Russia," New York Times Book Review, July 14, 1957, p. 10, from Literaturnaja gazeta, March 19, 1957.

7. Novoye Russkoye Slovo, December 9 and 13, 1957.

THE REVIVAL OF DOSTOEVSKIJ ON THE SOVIET STAGE

By Fan Parker

Brooklyn College

Dostoevskij returned home only last year, when his native country felt forced to commemorate the seventy-fifth anniversary of his death. The official opprobrium abruptly came to an end. A ten-volume edition of his artistic works was published in 300 thousand copies, in addition to separate editions of various individual works, for the first edition of Dostoevskij's artistic works in twenty-five years. (It should be noted that this edition includes neither The Diary of a Writer nor the critical and journalistic writings, which would require another four volumes, nor his correspondence.) An even more impressive manifestation of the revival of Dostoevskij is to be found in the scores of dramatizations and dramatic productions of Dostoevskij's novels in the theaters of the Soviet Union.

There is a long and important history of dramatizations of Dostoevskij's novels on the Russian stage. The dramatizations of Dostoevskij by the Moscow Art Theater, founded by Stanislavskij and Nemirovič-Dančenko in 1898, played a vital part in the history of the Russian theater. In 1910 it produced The Brothers Karamazov, which because of its length had to be performed on two successive evenings.¹ In 1913, Nikolaj Stavrogin (The Possessed) was presented. In September 1917, the Moscow Art Theater staged for the first time The Manor of Stepančikovo and Its Inhabitants; the part of Foma Fomič Opiskin was played by the famous Ivan Moskvín. Finally, in December 1929, the Theater presented Uncle's Dream, in which the famous Xmelev and and Knipper-Čexova had the leading parts. In 1930, there was an attempt made to show The Brothers Karamazov in one evening, but the play was found to be "too pessimistic," and it did not go beyond the dress rehearsal. On this the Moscow Art Theater severed its friendship with Dostoevskij.

Despite official disfavor, the years from 1924 through

the thirties found Dostoevskij's works favorites at the Polytechnical Museum and Moscow University. Readings from former dramatizations were performed by such stars as Kačalov, Moskv'in, Leonidov, Lužskij, Tarasova, Stepan Kuznecov, Orlenev, Giacintova.

If it was impossible from 1929 on to stage Dostoevskij's dramatizations in the Moscow Art Theater, what could be expected of lesser Soviet theaters? The sad story is that for the last twenty-seven years not a single new dramatization of Dostoevskij was made. Even through the entire year of 1955, not one single dramatization of this author was performed on the stage of any theater in the Soviet Union.

In early 1956 two important events, quite different in nature, but both very noteworthy, came to pass: in January the whole world marked the passing of seventy-five years since Dostoevskij's death, and in February at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party, Mr. Xruščev gave his de-Stalinization report about the liquidation of the "cult of personality." These two events coincided, and permitted Russia, in the early months of 1956, to recollect her great writer, Fedor Dostoevskij.

Now that Dostoevskij was admissable, a number of dramatizations were made and staged last year in Moscow, Leningrad, and the provincial theaters, while many new dramatizations of his novels are still in the making. Following are the registered new dramatizations of Dostoevskij's novels: Crime and Punishment, The Humiliated and Insulted, The Gambler, The Bad Predicament, The Manor of Stepančikovo and Its Inhabitants, The Idiot, Uncle's Dream, White Nights, The Brothers Karamazov. In Moscow alone, in the season 1956-57, four theaters presented dramatizations of four of his works: The Theater of the Cinema-actor, Uncle's Dream; the Ermolova Theater, Crime and Punishment; The Malyj Theater, The Manor of Stepančikovo; the Puškin Theater, The Gambler. Simultaneously three other Moscow theaters began preparation of three more plays: The Moscow Art Theater, The Brothers Karamazov; the Stanislavskij Theater, The Idiot; the Vaxtangov Theater, The Idiot.

In Leningrad in the same season, 1956-57, the following dramatizations were staged: in Alexandrinskij Theater, The Gamber, in the Theater of Lenin Komsomol, The Humiliated and Insulted, on television, White Nights. Besides

these, Uncle's Dream and The Idiot were staged in Leningrad and in the Leningrad Region. And finally, in many provincial theaters last year dramatizations of Crime and Punishment, The Idiot, Uncle's Dream, The Gambler, The Manor of Stepančikovo, The Humiliated and Insulted were staged. The dramatizations of The Humiliated and Insulted (there are three different variations) were performed about 230 times in provincial cities, and National Republics. All told, there were 230 performances in eight months of Dostoevskij's works performed by repertory companies. This is an impressive figure when one remembers that most companies perform six plays a week, generally each by a different author.

In Moscow, at the present time, three dramatizations of Dostoevskij's novels are being performed (the Theater of Cinema-actors, where Uncle's Dream was staged last year, has been closed, since the building has been given over to the Club of Cinemaworkers), and I should like now to share my impressions of seeing them last fall. The most outstanding of the three is Crime and Punishment, which carefully preserved the Dostoevskij texts.

Salvation through suffering, the nonconformity of heroes to the dictates of social behavior, the revolt against rigid rules in man's relationship to the world and God, the duality of the structure of the human soul, the consequent doom of the man who relies solely upon his intellectual strength in his dealings with problems of life—these are some of the Dostoevskian themes which have been retained in the Soviet version of Crime and Punishment. The chronic drunkard Marmeladov, brilliantly executed by A. G. Vasil'ev, in the opening scene of the play, reveals to Raskol'nikov the utter misery and hopelessness of his situation and the plight of his family. His chronic condition destroys all, until "there is nowhere to turn to," and forces his young daughter Sonja to be the provider through prostitution. His confession is the epitome of all human pathos, and Marmeladov-Vasil'ev in the tavern, turns to God, asking for His forgiveness and His compassionate understanding. This scene preserved Dostoevskij's text almost intact; however, in the rest of the play the "Christian" element has been omitted. Raskol'nikov, played by the famous Moscow actor, V. S. Jakut, capably expressed the hero's conflict between mind and heart. He conveys the manly staunchness of

Raskol'nikov's convictions that man is not a victim and a helpless mirror of external conditions, but possesses a rational freedom of choice of action, and Raskol'nikov's intense suffering from his conscience, the moral inquisitor. All the male parts are brilliantly performed; less successful in this play, however, are the feminine roles. Neither K. S. Gubina, as Sonja, nor E. I. Korneeva, as Dunja, is successful in bringing to the stage the real characters of Dostoevskij's novel. Furthermore, they use the speech of modern-day Soviet girls, and for one who feels the difference between the Russian language in the middle of the nineteenth century, when Crime and Punishment was written, and the Russian language in the middle of the present century, it is rather an odd, uncomfortable experience. The dramatist, S. A. Radzinskij, and the producer, P. P. Vasil'ev, have demonstrated their deep respect and regard for Dostoevskij. Also a revolving stage and the consecutive episodes add to the cohesion and dynamism of the production. This play, first produced on December 9, 1956, enjoyed wide popularity and at the end of the season the play was held over for twenty-five additional performances. This is noteworthy because the young Soviet generation is not very familiar with Dostoevskij, and judging by the reaction of the audience to certain incidents in the play, Dostoevskij's depth of thought does not always reach them.

On September 1, 1957, the Puškin Theater opened its season with a Dostoevskij dramatization which had never before been performed on the Russian stage, The Gambler. Before the curtain went up, the producer N. V. Petrov and the actors, armed with bouquets of flowers, came to the apron of the stage, and after a few words of welcome by Mr. Petrov, the actors tossed the flowers into the audience, creating an approving, warm rapport. One of the most beloved actresses of Moscow, V. G. Ranevskaja, in the role of the grandmother Antonida Vasil'evna, gave a superb performance. Chair-ridden through the play, she holds herself with amazing ease, even when she first appears in Roulettenburg before her avaricious relatives. The scene at the gambling table in the Casino when she has succumbed to the gambling fever, and the scene of salubrity after her heavy losses, are true artistic achievements. The central figure of the novel is, of course, Alexej Ivanovič, the teacher of the General's children. In this character Dostoevskij

portrays a man being devoured by two passions: love of woman and of gambling. The author well understood these emotions, since in the years preceeding the writing of the novel, he himself was the victim of an agonizing love and uncontrollable gambling. K. V. Vaxterov, in the title role, acted with competence, but at times in his attempt to emphasize the whirlpool of these passions, he overacted his part. Yet he succeeded in conveying the dual characteristics of the gambler: the triumphant Alexej Ivanovič at the moment of his great winnings of 200 thousand francs, and the entrapped Alexej Ivanovič who turns into a cheap seeker of fortune at any gambling table. Regrettably, the part of Polina, who is loved by the teacher and by Mr. Astley, played by E. A. Golovina, was not forcefully projected. Though possessing a rich, vibrant voice and an attractive appearance, Golovina failed to portray fully the willful, proud, and demoniac nature of Polina. The producer, Mr. Petrov, told me that he needed over eighty rehearsals for this play. He experienced certain difficulties, since the younger generation of actors did not know Dostoevskij as well as the actors of the first productions at the Moscow Art Theater, where Petrov began his theatrical career.

Even the Malyj Theater, which had an unfortunate experience with Dostoevskij during the 1899-1900 season, when The Idiot ran only nine performances, has decided at the beginning of the current year to stage The Manor of Stepančikovo. There are two reasons for the Malyj Theater's revival of Dostoevskij. The most important is the popular demand for the works of Dostoevskij. I learned this during a conversation with the producer of this play, L. A. Volkov. When I asked him why he chose this particular work of Dostoevskij, to show on the stage of the Malyj Theater, he admitted frankly that this novel has less dostoevščina. The actors, as I became convinced after seeing the play, departed drastically from Dostoevskij and made of this work a simple drama of life. Even such an accomplished actor as I. V. Il'inskij, who played the part of Foma Fomič Opiskin, depicted him as a likable though idiosyncratic fellow, giving him none of the foul, odious, and obnoxious qualities with which Dostoevskij endowed his hero. Mr. Volkov himself in our discussion admitted his own disagreement with the characterization of Foma Fomič as played by Il'inskij. On the whole, the common saying can be applied here: the operation

was successful but the patient died—the play was played, the actors acted well, but the author was dead.

The other reason for the Malyj Theater's interest in Dostoevskij is the usual one of attendance. Evidently last year's failure of Money by Sofronov, a Soviet play almost primitively written, which ran four nights to audiences of approximately forty people, was the impetus which caused the management of the Malyj to join the current interest in Dostoevskij. They probably felt that Dostoevskij, with his eternal questions, his unlimited sea of human passions and turbulent experiences, would attract an audience. And they were right; there is a large audience attending the play.

Besides these three plays which I saw performed in Moscow, there are three more in rehearsal: a new dramatization of The Brothers Karamazov in the Moscow Art Theater, The Idiot in the Stanislavskij Theater, and The Idiot in the Vaxtangov Theater. All of these plays will be ready before the end of the current season. In order to gain some insight into these forthcoming dramatizations, I spoke with the producers of these plays.

On September 10, 1957, I met with the producer of the world-renowned Moscow Art Theater, P. A. Markov, and with one of the most talented actors, B. H. Livanov, in the Museum of the Theater. Livanov recently produced the play Lomonosov, in which he played the major role. Now, Livanov in The Brothers Karamazov, appears for the first time as co-producer, actor, and the author of the dramatization of Dostoevskij's work, which he calls Dmitrij Karamazov. This conversation introduced me to novel approaches to Dostoevskij. The two gentlemen maintained that it is no longer possible to interpret Dostoevskij as he was interpreted by Russian thinkers, such as Berdjaev, Merežskovskij, and Rozanov, for Soviet life has "surpassed" all the facets of the past. He must now be interpreted in the light of Soviet philosophy. Because of this even The Possessed can now be safely dramatized on the Soviet stage. Livanov's interpretation finds The Brothers Karamazov a social tragedy; Dmitrij Karamazov, the main hero of the novel; the novel's philosophy, the love for humanity; the grandiose work, positive; the essential idea, the resurrection of Dmitrij; the main theme, a "theme of toil." [Sic!] Mr. Markov continued the interpretation: "What does Dostoevskij say in his novel? That man cannot live as a scoundrel,

that honest toil justifies human life! Since Dmitrij aspires to better himself, he is that positive hero who is on the way to happiness. Without the storm which overtakes Dmitrij, he would not have known how to live, and toil would have remained for him incomprehensible. This is the interpretation which must be given Dostoevskij on the basis of the new Russian reality. All of Dostoevskij's religious thought, his mysticism and his tortuosity, have long become inapplicable to contemporary Soviet life and have no significance in reality. Too often Dostoevskij himself presented conflicting ideas and through this conflict destroyed the validity of his own belief!" Then Mr. Markov and Livanov both agreed that Dostoevskij has always been read by Soviet youth, attracted by his psychological depths and the power of his language. "It is, therefore, more correct to say," Livanov stated, "that Dostoevskij did not return to Russia but rather, that he has always occupied an honored place in the Soviet Union!"

There was no need for me to enter into an argument about the interpretation of this great novel, or about the preposterous suggestion that the main theme of The Brothers Karamazov is the "theme of toil." Nor did I attempt to show how erroneous their interpretation is, in singling out Dmitrij and reducing all the other major characters to fragmentary parts in their attempt to Sovietize Dostoevskij.

My observations, limited as they were to events in Moscow, still indicate what is happening throughout Russia, since it can be said with assurance that what is characteristic of Moscow is characteristic of the whole country. And even the data taken by me from official sources, testify that, during the last theater season, 700 plays of Dostoevskij were performed in the Moscow theaters, Leningrad, the provinces, and National Republics, the Ukraine, White Russia, Azerbaidzhan, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia. When one bears in mind that in 1955 not a single dramatization of Dostoevskij was presented anywhere in the Soviet Union, this is a new and significant demonstration of interest.

The same circumstances regarding Dostoevskij on the Soviet stage, existed in the cinema for the past many decades. To the embarrassment of Soviet cinema the following data must be given: for the forty years of its existence there were only two films made on Dostoevskian themes, one in 1932 when the producer Feodorov filmed The House

of the Dead, and the second in 1934 when a film based on White Nights and Netočka Nezvanova, called Petersburg Nights, was produced by Rošal. Twenty-three years passed, years which saw fine productions of Soviet films. Producers may have longed to film Dostoevskij's novels, but nothing came to pass, even though outstanding film adaptations of Dostoevskij's novels were produced in Western countries. Only now, at the end of 1957, in the Moscow film studio has work commenced on The Idiot.

As the Soviet film industry attempted to avoid Dostoevskij, the Soviet press is now trying to ignore his works. When I sought reviews of current Dostoevskij plays in Moscow, I discovered that with the exception of one or two reviews in the less important papers, none had been written. Soviet critics are apparently not aware of just how they should evaluate this controversial writer in whom the public has taken such a keen interest.

It has not been easy for Dostoevskij to make his way to his descendants in his native land. Some of the interpretations of the significance of Dostoevskij's art which I encountered seemed quite dichotomous. Several pedagogues, in private conversation, expressed blind belief in the official doctrine that for Soviet youth the study of Dostoevskij could have no intellectual validity. They refused to accept his return to his native soil as a welcome event. The same opinion is also shared by some Soviet writers. The famous Soviet writer and playwright, Valentin Kataev, said to me in the fall of 1956 in the Union of Soviet Writers: "Dostoevskij is harmful for Soviet youth. Had I the power to forbid the reading of Dostoevskij, I would do so." In September 1957, I had the opportunity to see him again and to ask him what he thought about the great popularity these plays enjoy. He curtly replied that there is less dostoevščina in the plays than in his novels. And he is right.

It seems to me, however, that there will be less and less of this attitude toward Dostoevskij, and that more people will come to share the opinion of another popular Soviet writer, Leonid Leonov. Thanks to the courtesy of the Foreign Commission of the Union of Soviet Writers, I had the pleasure of meeting and talking with Leonov, whose early works written in 1920's show clearly the influence of Dostoevskij. Leonov, even today, does not deny his great admiration and sincere reverence for the writer, but says

that "no matter what is done, Dostoevskij cannot be eliminated." He feels that Soviet youth's familiarity with the writer can in no way produce harmful effects, nor can the reading of Dostoevskij be stopped, for he will be reckoned with as long as humanity exists.

Note

1. Older-generation Americans may still recall that when the Moscow Art Theater toured America in 1922-24, the dramatization of The Brothers Karamazov was shown in one evening. An unpublished letter of Stanislavskij (New York, 1923) is preserved, where, with a feeling of deep satisfaction, he speaks of the great actress Eleanore Duse, who attended this performance twice. The second time she came unannounced, and sat in the last rows. Learning of this, Stanislavskij came over to see her. Here is what he writes further in this letter: "I went into the theater and sat with her. She told me that we have achieved the highest stage in theater; that ours is not a theater, but a church, that we are the only true company in the world. . . . Had she been well, she would not have omitted a single performance."

THE PHONEMIC SYSTEM OF COLLOQUIAL STANDARD BULGARIAN

By Harold L. Klagstad, Jr.

Indiana University

The purpose of this article is to present the vocalic and consonantal phonemes of a Slavic colloquial standard language which, in comparison with such a standard of Russian, Czech, Polish, or Serbo-Croatian, has been little studied in this country or in western Europe. Indeed, Bulgarian as a whole is considered even nowadays by many Slavists as being more or less a member of that group of Slavic literary languages, e. g., Kashubian, Low and High Sorbian, Slovenian, which are usually only mentioned briefly in lists or in encyclopedias and whose principal function in the Slavic field seems to be that of providing pertinent lexical items for comparison and the occasional pedagogical grammar for review.

General Bulgarian, however, because of the number of its native speakers (about seven million in Bulgaria alone),¹ which is the highest of any of the "minor" Slavic languages possessing a written standard excepting Belorussian (up to eight million native speakers in eastern Europe),² and of the interest taken in the language by the West and by the Soviet Union for military and political reasons, has lately received a good deal of attention. Unfortunately, only a small amount of generally accessible work in English has been done with any regard to a descriptive analysis of literary standard Bulgarian.³ That work which has been done in other languages (including Bulgarian) has either been hasty as concerns the phonology of the language, quasi-historical in treatment,⁴ artificial because of a purely normative approach,⁵ or largely ignored.⁶

The determination and description of the colloquial standard Bulgarian phonemes are done in this paper in articulatory, acoustic, and distributive terms. Four types of notation are used throughout: (1) transliteration, in which

Bulgarian forms are italicized, (2) phonemic transcription, in which Bulgarian forms are transcribed between diagonals, (3) morphophonemic transcription, in which Bulgarian morphemes are transcribed without diagonals,⁷ and (4) phonetic transcription, in which Bulgarian forms are broadly transcribed between square brackets. Only transcribed forms are stressed; this is shown by an acute mark over a vowel.

The stress in general Bulgarian is an expiratory accentual type. Depending upon the particular dialect or group of dialects it can either be free and phonemic or bound and non-phonemic. In very broad terms the belt from strong, free, phonemic stress to less strong, bound, non-phonemic stress runs from northeast to southwest within the political boundaries of the Bulgarian People's Republic.

The corpus for this study consists of taped Bulgarian sequences in the form of elicited word lists and conversations taken in July, August, and September 1956 from two Bulgarian informants, or native speakers of the language. The first informant used was Miss Rosa Zlatanov of Bloomington, Indiana, and a native of Sofia. She is 36 years old and completed her gymnasium education in Sofia in 1940. The second informant used was Mr. Luben Radev, also of Bloomington, and also a native of Sofia. He is 33 years old and attended the University of Sofia as a law student from 1945 to 1948. Both informants speak French fluently as a second language and use English as a third language. One informant (Zlatanov) possesses rather the French uvular trill [ʀ] than the general Bulgarian rolled [r].

A sound spectrograph was used in determining the distinctive features of the colloquial standard Bulgarian phonemes.

General Remarks

1. The two versions of Bulgarian represented here by the recorded sequences of the two informants (Zlatanov, or Z., and Radev, or R.) are called colloquial standard Bulgarian. This standard is also considered as the Sofia standard, as opposed, for example, to the Tarnovo (colloquial) standard. It is not considered the non-standard dialect of the Sofia area, nor is it considered the so-called literary standard as described by Andrejčin et al.

1.1. A Bulgarian word can possess only one stressed syllable.⁸

1.2. Vocalic phonemes.

1.21. Stressed phonemes.

1.211. In articulatory terms the stressed vowels can be traditionally diagrammed as follows:

/i/			/u/
	/e/	/ə/	/o/
		/a/	

Examples: /lak/ (varnish), /lek/ (easy), /lik/ (face), /lok/ (bait), /luk/ (onion), /lək/ (bow).

1.2111. In terms of high low, front back, and rounded articulations the six vowels can be described as follows:

/e/	: mid front
/i/	: high front
/a/	: low back unrounded
/ə/	: mid back unrounded
/o/	: mid back rounded
/u/	: high back rounded

1.212. In acoustic terms the stressed vowels are designated in this way:

	/u/	/ə/	/o/	/a/	/i/	/e/
Compact/Non-compact	-	-	-	+	-	-
Diffuse/Non-diffuse	+	-	-	-	+	-
Grave/Acute	+	+	+	+	-	-
Flat/Plain	+	-	+	-	0	0

1.213. Allophones of /u/. These are [y] and [u]. [y] occurs after palatalized consonants (see 1.32 ff.) and [u] occurs elsewhere: [l'yt] (fierce), [b'yst] (bust); [lut] (insane), [bunt] (revolt).

1.214. Allophones of /i/. [i] occurs in all positions: [sin] (son), [sin] (blue), [l+ik] (face), [ʊʒitɪl] (teacher). /i/ never occurs after palatalized consonants or /j/ (see 1.33 ff.).

1.215. Allophones of /e/. These are [e] and [ɛ]. [e] occurs before [j] or a palatalized consonant and [ɛ] occurs elsewhere: [pɛjka] (bench), [sɛl'əsɪ] (I settle); [mʊrɛtʊ]

(the sea), [sɛlʋ] (village). /e/ never occurs after palatalized consonants or /j/.

1.216. Allophones of /o/. These are [o] and [ɔ]. [o] occurs before [j] or a palatalized consonant and [ɔ] occurs elsewhere: [koj] (who?), [vɔz'ə] (I carry); [gɔl] (naked), [g'ɔl] (stagnant pond), [pɪsmɔtʋ] (the letter), [vɔlə] (the ox).

1.217. Allophones of /ə/. [ʊ] occurs in all positions: [sp'ʊ] (I sleep), [lʊk] (bow), [ɪzl+ɪʃʊ] (I strike off), [ʊgələ] (the corner).

1.218. Allophones of /a/. These are [a] and [ɑ]. [a] occurs after palatalized consonants, and [j] and [ɑ] occur elsewhere: [l'átɲə] (adj.: summer), [n'am] (mute), [zɪm'á] (earth); [májɲə] (mother), [lɔk] (varnish), [ɪmá] (had), [zəbáv'ə] (I delay), [jábəlɲə] (apple).

1.219. All of the allophones given above of the stressed vowels can be presented in this way:

[i]	[y]	[u]
[e]	[ʊ]	[o]
[ɛ]	[ɔ]	
[a]	[ɑ]	

1.22. Unstressed phonemes.

1.221. In articulatory terms the unstressed vowels are:

/i/	/u/
/ə/	

Examples: /grəduvéti/ (the cities), /góvuri/ (dialects), /guvurí/ (speak!).

1.222. In acoustic terms the unstressed vowels are:

	/u/	/ə/	/i/
Compact/Non-compact	-	-	-
Diffuse/Non-diffuse	+	-	+
Grave/Acute	+	+	-
Flat/Plain	+	-	0

1.223. Allophones of /u/. These [ʏ] and [ʊ]. [ʏ] occurs after palatalized consonants and [ʊ] occurs elsewhere: [l'ʏtʃɪ] (piquant), [b'ʏfɛt] (buffet); [grəduvé] (cities), [gɔvʊr] (dialect).

1.224. Allophones of /i/. [ɪ] occurs in all positions: [sɪlátə] (the villages), [rɪká] (river), [bél+ɪ] (plur.: white), [nʃtɪ] (nights). /i/ never occurs after palatalized consonants or /j/.

1.225. Allophones of /ə/. [ə] occurs in all positions: [grədút] (the city), [sínə] (adj.: blue), [músətə] (the table), [vrəguvɛ́] (enemies).

1.226. All of the allophones given above of the unstressed are:

[ɪ]

[ɪ]

[ʊ]

[ə]

1.23. Prosodic morphophonemic alternations. The expiratory stress is free and phonemic, e.g., /grədót/ (the city), /grədúvɛti/ (the cities); /sélʊ/ (village), /silátə/ (the villages); /sínə/ (adj.: blue), /sin'ós/ (I make blue); /búčə/ (I shove into, thrust), /bučs/ (I grumble, snarl).

1.231. /é/~/i/, e.g., sel- /sélʊ/ (village), /silá/ (villages); rek- /réčín/ (adj.: river), /riká/ (river); zem'- /zémin/ (terrestrial; earthly), /zim'á/ (earth).

1.232. /ó/~/u/, e.g., govor'- /góvur/ (dialect), /guvórə/ (I speak); po--mošt- /pómuš/ (help), /pumóšnik/ (assistant), /pómuštin/ (adj.: auxiliary); sol- /sol/ (salt), /sulén/ (salted).

1.233. /á/~/ə/, e.g., grad- /grat/ (city), /grədót/ (the city); vrag- /vrak/ (enemy), /vrəguvɛ́/ (enemies); sil-a /síla/ (strength), rek-a /riká/ (river).

1.3. Consonantal phonemes.

1.31. Unpalatalized phonemes.

1.311. Labials. These are /p, b, f, v, m/. Examples: /pil/ (drank), /bil/ (struck), /film/ (film), /vil/ (twisted), /mil/ (washed).

1.312. Dentals. These are /t, d, s, z, n/. Examples: /til/ (nape), /dil'ós/ (I divide), /síla/ (strength), /zilén/ (green), /nil/ (Nile).

1.313. Velars. These are /k, g, x/. Examples: /kil/ (Kiel), /gílzə/ (cartridge case), /xíl'əsi/ (I chuckle).

1.314. Affricates. These are /č, ž, c/. Examples: /číli/ (Chile), /žílátin/ (executioner), /církə/ (the circus).

1.315. Hushing sibilants. These are /š, ž/. Examples: /šil/ (sewed), /žílkə/ (vein).

1.316. Liquids. These are /r, l/. Examples: /rflə/ (Rila), /lfləf/ (adj.: violet, lilac).

1.317. Allophones.

1.3171. Stops. These are

[p]	[b]	[t]	[d]	[k]	[g]	[č]	[ʒ]	[c]
[aspirated p]	[aspirated t]	[aspirated k]					[3]	

The aspirated stops, which are not shown in phonetic transcription examples here, occur in initial prevocalic position, e.g., [kʊrɐf] (stiff), in immediate intervocalic pretonic position, e.g., [čɪtʊ] (I read), or in final position, e.g., [dup] (oak tree), and the corresponding unaspirated stops occur elsewhere. The other unaspirated stops occur in non-final position (for [b], [d], [g], [ʒ], [3]) and in initial, medial and final positions (for [č], [c]).

1.31711. [c] and [3]. If these two stops were to be considered separate phonemes, as is frequently done,⁹ the status of the phoneme /3/ becomes highly questionable in view of the no more than twenty or so nursery forms, onomatopetic interjections, Turkisms and regional or free variants in which it occurs:¹⁰

dza! dza! (nursery words: see? look!)

dzən! dzən-dzən! / zən! zən-zən! (interjection: imitation of humming, clinking sound)

dzanka (stringed instrument)

dzankam/zənkam (I strum)

dzviska (regional: yearling lamb) / zviska (yearling lamb)

dzift/zift (tar; pitch)

dživgar/dživgar/zəvgar (team of oxen, horses)

dzipam (regional: I kick, stamp) / zipam (I kick, stamp)

dzil/zil (Turkism: castanet)

dzerkeli/zərkeli (pej.: eyes)

dzembri (eye discharge, "sleep")

dzendzam (of horses: be lame in hind legs)

A phoneme /3/ contrasts with no other phoneme in the system under discussion. Sequences with /z/ or /dz/, therefore, must be considered as phonemically relevant and not those with a /3/ stop.

[3], as an allophone of /c/, occurs in medial position before /b, d, z, g, ʒ, ʒ/, e.g., [ʊtɛ3bɛʒɪ] (a priest was),

[əmɪrɪkónɪʒdʊkládva] (an American reports). [ʒ] occurs before /v/ only at word boundaries: [ɪspánɪʒ víʒdə] (a Spaniard sees), but [cvétɪ] (flower). The allophone [c] of /c/ occurs elsewhere.

1.3172. Spirants. These are

[f] [v] [s] [z] [x] [ʃ] [ʒ]

[ɣ]

The voiced velar spirant [ɣ] occurs as an allophone of /x/ in medial position before /b, d, z, g, ʒ, ʒ/, e.g., [íməɣbʊkvár] (I had a primer), [vɪd'áɣgræduí] (I saw the city). [ɣ] occurs before /v/ only at word boundaries: [vɪd'áɣvræguí] (I saw the enemy), but [máxvəm] (I remove). The allophone [x] of /x/ occurs elsewhere. [v], [z], and [ʒ] occur in non-final position and [f], [s], and [ʃ] occur in initial, medial, and final positions.

1.3173. Sonorants. These are

[m] [n] [r] [l]

[ŋ] [l+]

The velar nasal [ŋ] occurs as an allophone of /n/ in medial position before velars, e.g., [təŋk] (tank), [fləŋɣʊvɪ] (flanks), [m'ŋɣxɪn] (Munich). The fronted apical lateral [l+] occurs as an allophone of /l/ in initial and medial position before front vowels, e.g., [l+ik] (face), [l+ɛk] (easy), [l+ɪsɪcə] (fox). The velar apical lateral [l], an allophone of /l/, occurs elsewhere. [m] and [r] occur in initial, medial and final positions.

1.32. Palatalized phonemes.¹¹

1.321. Labials. These are /p', b', f', v', m'/. Examples: /kərp'ə/ (I mend) and /kərp'a/ (towel), /b'al/ (white) and /bal/ (bale), /truf'ə/ (I adorn) and /truf'a/ (attire), /v'álə/ (she winnowed) and /válə/ (the cylinder), /m'árkə/ (measure) and /márkə/ (sign; brand).

1.322. Dentals. These are /t', d', s', z', n'/. Examples: /púst'ə/ (I release) and /pústə/ (deserted), /d'al/ (part) and /dal/ (gave), /gləs'ə/ (I prepare) and /gləsə/ (the voice), /gáz'ə/ (I wade) and /gázə/ (the gas), /n'am/ (mute) and /nam/ (to us).

1.323. Velars. These are /k', g'/. Examples: /k'up/ (jug) and /kup/ (heap; crowd), /g'ol/ (stagnant pond) and /gol/ (naked).

1.324. Liquids. These are /r', l'/. Examples: /párə/ (I steam, scald) and /pára/ (steam), /l'ut/ (fierce) and /lut/ (crazy).

1.325. Affricates. This is /c'/. Examples: /c'ar/ (remedy; cure) and /car/ (tsar).

1.326. Allophones.

1.3261. Stops. These are

[p']	[b']	[t']	[d']	[k']	[g']	[c']
[aspirated p']	[aspirated t']	[aspirated k']				

The aspirated stops, which are not shown in phonetic transcription examples here, occur in initial prevocalic position, e.g., [k'órəf] (blind; careless), or in immediate intervocalic pretonic position, e.g., [l+ɪt'ú] (I fly), and the corresponding unaspirated stops occur elsewhere. The other stops occur in non-final position.

1.3262. Spirants. These are

[f']	[v']	[s']	[z']
------	------	------	------

The spirants occur in initial prevocalic and medial prevocalic position only, e.g., [v'átər] (wind), [nós'ə] (I carry).

1.3263. Sonorants. These are

[m']	[n']	[r']	[l']
------	------	------	------

The sonorants occur in initial prevocalic and medial prevocalic position only, e.g., [m'átəm] (I throw), [búr'ə] (storm).

1.33. /j/. This phoneme is a palatal glide. Examples: /moj/ (sing.: my, mine) and /mói/ (plur.: my, mine), /igráj/ (play!) and /igrái/ (he, she, it plays), /mij/ (wash!) and /míi/ (he, she, it washes), /jat/ (anger) and /at/ (hell).

1.331. Distribution. /j/ occurs in initial, medial and final position.

1.3311. Initial position. /j/ occurs before back vowels only: /jam/ (I eat), /júnicə/ (heifer), /jəjčár/ (egg-seller), /jugúrt/ (yogurt), /jok/ (no! certainly not!).

1.3312. Medial position. Intervocalic /j/ occurs with back vowels only: /igrájə/ (I play), /tvójə/ (sing: your, yours), /bəjáxə/ (they charmed), /čújə/ (I hear), /pujávə/ (appearance), /dujé/ (I milk). The only other distribution

of /j/ is vowel-/j/-consonant (cluster): /májka/ (mother), /májski/ (adj.: May), /bújstvu/ (uproar), /bəséjn/ (basin).

1.3313. Final position. /j/ occurs postvocally only, after all vowels: /maj/ (May), /moj/ (sing.: my, mine), /mij/ (wash!), /pej/ (sing!), /taj/ (so), /tuj/ (that).

1.4. In acoustic terms the total number of phonemes in colloquial standard Bulgarian is shown in the following table:

FEATURES	PHONEMES (45)																				
	k	k'	g	g'	x	č	č'	š	ž	t	t'	d	d'	s	s'	z	z'	c	c'	n	n'
Vocalic-NV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cons-NC	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Comp-NComp	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diff-NDiff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Grave-Acute	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flat-Plain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nasal-Oral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Cont-Disc	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	0	0	0
Voiced-Unv	-	-	+	+	0	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Sharp-Plain	-	+	-	+	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+
Strid-Mellow	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
Stressed-Unstr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FEATURES	p	p'	b	b'	f	f'	v	v'	m	m'	ǔ	ǔ'	ǝ	ǝ'	ǎ	ǎ'	ǐ	ǐ'	ǐ'	r	r'	l	l'	j
Vocalic-NV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cons-NC	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Comp-NComp	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
Diff-NDiff	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Grave-Acute	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	0	0	0	0	0
Flat-Plain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	-	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nasal-Oral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cont-Disc	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	+	+	0
Voiced-Unv	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sharp-Plain	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	-	+	+
Strid-Mellow	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stressed-Unstr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	0	0	0	0

1.41. Colloquial standard Bulgarian possesses three paired stressed and unstressed vocalic phonemes (/ǔ-u, ǎ-ǎ, ǐ-i/) and three vocalic phonemes which are not so paired (/ǝ, ǎ, ǐ/), or nine vowels. The language has 13 paired sharp and plain phonemes marked by the consonantal feature (/k'-k, g'-g, t'-t, d'-d, s'-s, z'-z, c'-c, n'-n, p'-p, b'-b, f'-f, v'-v, m'-m/), two paired sharp and plain

phonemes marked by both the consonantal and the vocalic feature (/r'-r, l'-l/), five phonemes which are not so paired but marked by the consonantal feature (/x, č, ž, š, ž/) and one phoneme which is marked by the sharp feature only (/j/).

1.42. Distribution of sharp phonemes.

1.421. /k', g', c'/. These are in root morpheme initial (cluster) prevocalic distribution before grave vowel phonemes only: k'up- /k'up/ (jug), s#--k'up- /sk'úpə/ (with the jug); g'ol- /g'ol/ (stagnant pond), v#--g'ol- /vg'ol/ (in a stagnant pond); c'ar- /c'ar/ (remedy; cure), v#--c'ar- /fc'ar/ (in a cure).

1.422. Distribution of other sharp phonemes. These are in non-final distribution before grave vowel phonemes only: /kon/ (horse), /kón'ət/ (the horse); /car/ (tsar), /cár'ət/ (the tsar); /sl'ap/ (sing.: blind), /slépi/ (plur.: blind); /sp'ə/ (I sleep), /spiš/ (you sleep).

2. The dialectology. The Sofia colloquial standard of Bulgarian can be defined further in two contexts: (a) as a dialect of general Bulgarian and (b) as a south Slavic dialect.

2.1. General Bulgarian context. As a dialect contained within the political boundaries of the Bulgarian People's Republic, the Sofia colloquial standard can be defined as the result of a linguistic "compromise." Such a compromise involves principally on the one hand the colloquial standard dialect of Tarnovo and on the other the dialect of Sofia, the present capital of the Bulgarian People's Republic.

2.11. Tarnovo. This city of approximately 16,000 inhabitants (1946)¹² situated on the Jantra in north central Bulgaria was one of the chief political and cultural centers of old Bulgaria, the capital of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1186-1257) and up to 1879 the capital of the Bulgarian state. It is the birthplace and formative milieu of Petko R. Slavej-
kov (1827-95), the first outstanding modern Bulgarian poet and an influential publicist and educator.

2.111. Xristo Botev (1849-76). This "revolutionary-romantic" poet was born in Kalofer, in central Bulgaria, about forty-seven miles southwest of Tarnovo.¹³ He is the political and literary hero of Bulgarian nationalism and freedom from the Turkish yoke in the nineteenth century.

2.112. Ivan Vazov (1850-1921). This writer, the most important Bulgarian literary figure of the 1870's and 1880's, a poet of the first rank and author of the first Bulgarian

novel (Under the Yoke, 1889), was born in Sopot (now Vazovgrad), in central Bulgaria, about eleven miles west of Kalofer.

2.113. The influence of the work of Slavejkov, Botev, and Vazov was tremendous in the shaping of a new literary standard language, since all three writers used their very similar native spoken dialects as bases for their written medium.

2.114. The pertinent common denominators of these dialects are comparatively 1) a high number of consonants in the systems because of the presence of palatalized and unpalatalized phonemes, 2) a phonemic stress accent, 3) a low number of vowels because of fewer unstressed phonemes, and 4) a narrow distribution of the palatalized consonants, i. e., before back vowels only.

2.12. Sofia. The present capital (since 1879) and largest city, situated on two tributaries of the Iskär—the Perlovska and the Vladajska—and possessing 435,000 inhabitants (1946),¹⁴ lies about 36 miles east of the nearest Yugoslav border point (Dimitrovgrad, formerly Caribrod).

2.121. The dialect (non-standard, or non-educated) of the Sofia area comparatively contains 1) a low number of consonants in the system due to the absence of palatalized phonemes, 2) a phonemic stress accent, and 3) a high number of vowels because of more unstressed phonemes.

2.13. The "compromise" dialect. The Sofia colloquial standard system as a structural composite of 2.114 and 2.121 above has, first, a high number of consonantal phonemes. The allophonic distribution, however, is neither that of the Tarnovo type or of the Sofia type. For example, in the Tarnovo standard [s'] occurs before front and back vowels, in the Sofia dialect [s'] does not occur, and in the Sofia colloquial standard [s'] occurs before back vowels only. Secondly, the Sofia colloquial standard has a low number of vowels (9). The Tarnovo standard also has the same nine vowels (six stressed and three unstressed). The Sofia dialect, however, has 12 vowel phonemes (/ú-u, í-i, ó-o, é-e, á-a, é-ə/).

2.2. South Slavic context. As a colloquial standard dialect the Sofia standard can be equated with those colloquial standard dialects of the other capitals of the south Slavic area: Ljubljana (Slovene), Zagreb (Croatian), Belgrade (Serbian), and Skopje (Macedonian).

Notes

1. S. B. Bernštejn, Bolgarsko-russkij slovar' (Moskva, 1953), p. 855.

2. Roman Jakobson, Slavic Languages (2d ed.; New York: King's Crown Press, 1955), p. 1. The number of speakers of Belorussian was taken as of 1939.

3. Cf. W. R. Morfill, A Short Grammar of the Bulgarian Language (London, 1897); A Concise Grammar of the Bulgarian Language (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918). In Morfill's work the type font now used generally to portray Old Church Slavic Cyrillic letters is used for all (modern) Bulgarian forms.

4. See particularly L. Beaulieux, Grammaire de la langue bulgare (Paris, 1933). This work must still be regarded as the most complete "descriptive" grammar of Bulgarian produced in the West. The second edition, published in Paris in 1950, is the same as the first, with the exception of four added pages of notes (xiii-xvi), on the 1945 orthographic reforms and two other changes on pp. 47-48 and p. 79.

5. See, for example, L. Andrejčin, N. Kostov, K. Mirčev, E. Nikolov, and S. Stojkov, Bolgarski ezik (Sofia, 1955); E. I. Bezikovič and T. P. Gordova-Rybal'čenko, Bolgarskij jazyk: učebnik dlja vuzov (Leningrad University, 1957).

6. See, for example, S. Stojkov, "Palatální souhlásky ve spisovné bulharštině," Slavia, XIX (1949), 76-85; K. Horálek, "K otázce palatálních souhlásek v bulharštině," Slavia, XX (1950), 57-60; N. S. Trubetzkoy, Principes de phonologie (Paris, 1949), pp. 55, 62, et passim; Ju. S. Maslov, Očerki bolgarskoj grammatiki (Moskva, 1956), pp. 7-42.

7. In morphophonemic transcription prefixes, prepositions, preverbs and proclitics are separated from a following morpheme by a double hyphen and are designated separately by a following double hyphen. Root morphemes and suffixes are separated from one another by a single hyphen. Root morphemes are designated separately by a following single hyphen, non-terminal suffixes are designated separately between single hyphens, and terminal suffixes are so designated by a preceding single hyphen. Enclitics are separated from a preceding morpheme by a double hyphen and are designated separately by a preceding double hyphen.

8. A word is here defined as a prosodically conditioned entity consisting of (1) a free morpheme only, e.g., tibišir-/tibišir/ (chalk), of (2) bound morphemes, e.g., mas-a /mása/ (table), mas-a--ta /máseta/ (the table),

mas-a--ta--ni /másetani/ (our table), or of (3) both bound and free morphemes, e.g., tibišir--a--ni /tibišírani/ (our chalk), kade--šti /kadéšti/ (where will?).

9. See, for example, F. Sławski, Gramatyka języka bułgarskiego (Warsaw, 1954), pp. 17 ff.; Andrejčin, Kostov, Mirčev, Nikolov and Stojkov, op. cit., pp. 23 ff.

10. The forms listed above have been gleaned from recently published dictionaries, including volume I (A - K) of the new Rečnik na savremennija bŭlgarski knižoven ezik of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Sofia, 1955). By no means all of these forms are used or recognized by informant Z. or R.

11. See particularly the highly informative article of M. I. Matusevič, "Eksperimental'no-fonetičeskie issledovanija soglasnyx bolgarskogo jazyka," Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta slavjanovedeniya, No. 15 (Academy of Sciences, USSR, Moscow, 1955), pp. 3-16, in which Sofia standard (Stojko Stojkov), Tŕnovo standard (Stefan Kačauinov) and Russian standard palatalized and unpalatalized consonants are compared. X-ray photographs, palatograms, and kymograms are used.

12. Bol'shaja sovetskaja ènciklopedija (2d ed.), s.v. "Tŕnovo," XLIII, 527c.

13. Botev is the present Bulgarian literary standard spelling; the older Botjov or Bot'ov are spellings based on the Tŕnovo colloquial standard.

14. N. S. Zauer, N. I. Popov, V. I. Čexarin, Bolgarija: geografičeskie očerki (Moskva, 1953), p. 252.

THE SOVIETIZATION OF ALBANIAN EDUCATION

By Joseph S. Roucek

University of Bridgeport (Conn.)

Formal Education Structure

The pro-Soviet educational system was set up by the law of August 17, 1946.¹ It was inspired by the Soviet system, and the new generation is now to be educated "in a pacifistic spirit, with true patriotism, and a feeling of love for the Soviet Union, Stalin, and our Party!"² Article 28 of the 1945 Constitution states that, in order to raise the level of general culture among the population, the state guarantees to all classes the opportunity of attending the country's schools and various cultural institutions. Primary education is free, and the law of August 17, 1946, states that school attendance is compulsory.

The educational system is uniform; all the schools are controlled by the State; schools are undenominational, and the Ministry of Education controls the whole system. Education begins in the nursery school. "Under the present system, the children of war victims or cripples, as well as orphans and the children of needy workers and peasants, can be looked after free of charge." School attendance is compulsory between the ages of seven and twelve; new higher primary schools, with seven classes, have been opened. The secondary schools have four classes. There are two types of secondary schools—those which give a general education, and the technical secondary schools; the latter include financial, medical, and agricultural schools, and the technical school at Tirana (divided in 1946 into four sections: mechanics, administration, agriculture, and electricity). There is also an Art School with five sections: theory of music, piano, singing, violin, and plastic arts.

Secondary professional schools were founded on October 10, 1950, along Soviet lines; these "teknikums" are divided into "low" and "middle schools." The first have courses from six months to two years; the middle schools,

four years. The *teknikums* are run by various Ministries, and students with the background of a seven-year school are eligible to enroll. There are professional schools for medicine (assistant to physicians), finance, commerce, the petroleum industry, and agriculture, and the graduates are assigned to appointments by the government.

In 1951, the Council of Ministers founded three institutes of higher learning, called "high institutes," to give "to science, culture, and technique in our country broader perspectives and to create conditions for their further development, according to the example of science, culture, and technique of the Soviet Union, so that they may be of service to the working masses and factors in the development of the economy of our country, and in order to form the intelligentsia of our land." A High Pedagogical Institute and High Medical Institutes have been opened.

Pre-war Albania could not boast of any learned society. The occupying Italians founded an Institute of Albanian Studies, later replaced, after the departure of the conquering armies, with the Albanian Institute for Sciences and Arts, and, by the Communists, with the Institute of Sciences. It has published some valuable studies of the flora and fauna of Albania, some geological studies, a valuable dictionary of the Albanian language (1955), and a collection of historical documents along Marxist-Leninist lines. The administration of the whole system is under the Ministry of Education and Culture, which in 1953 absorbed the Committee on Arts and Culture, the Radio Broadcast Committee, and the Direction of Publications.

Education of Teachers. The Senior Teacher Training Institute, opened at Tirana in 1947, was the first higher educational institution in Albania. In addition to a general teaching course, there are courses in three specialized sections: physics and mathematics, history and geography, and natural science. The Institute has a two-year course for training teachers for the seven-year schools (higher primary schools); it has trained, since 1951, the teachers for secondary schools, who take a four-year course equivalent to that in a university.

Communist Control

As in all satellite states, the duty of the Albanian

schools is "to furnish the new generation with Marxist-Leninist learning." "To educate pupils ideo-politically means to endow them with the scientific ideology of communism," proclaimed an Albanian educational leader. Furthermore, "since education is a phenomenon of social life and as such reflects the ideology of the class in power, pedagogy in the schools cannot be treated separately from the political life of the country and from the problems which pre-occupy our party today . . ."³

In 1944 Albania had probably the highest rate of illiteracy in Europe—some eighty percent.⁴ A law of 1949 required every citizen between the ages of twelve and forty to study. By 1952 more than half a million Albanians had been taught how to read and write, a decided advantage for the successful operation of the propaganda agencies.

All teaching, on all levels, is carried on within the Marxist-Leninist ideological framework, which is the sine qua non of all cultural activities, on the premise the education, the arts, and the sciences are Communist weapons, and that intellectuals who practice them are to be soldiers of Communism, inspired by the militant philosophy of Marx and Lenin. The task of the Albanian teacher is to educate youth to hate the "instigators of a new imperialistic war," the Anglo-American "imperialists" and their roles in the Balkans. Bedri Spahiu, Albanian Minister of Education, proclaimed in September 1952: "The schools now give all of you a Communist education. That is why you have a great love for your Fatherland and the Soviet Union and why you hate the American imperialists—your enemies." In contrast to Albanian education, American education is evaluated as follows: "The system of teaching in American schools is based on chauvinism and hatred of other peoples. The theory of racial superiority, as in Hitler's Germany, is the main theme of American education today. . . . Copying the methods of Hitler, the reactionary Americans are burning the books of scientists, distinguished writers, and papers and magazines showing a progressive spirit. At the beginning of this year all the books of Howard Fast were removed from all school libraries in New York City. . . . In the books which American students study, every reference or page which speaks about successes or ideas in the progressive countries is carefully taken out . . ."⁵

Periodically teachers must attend political seminars

where everything Russian is extolled, and where the indoctrination is so slanted as to lead the listener to identify himself with the world Communist movement, and to conclude that Communism represents the inevitable development of Albania's national heritage and culture. Outstanding teachers are honored with titles as arëstimtar i dalluar (distinguished educator), mësues i dalluar (distinguished teacher), mësues i merituar (meritorious teacher), or mësues i popullit (teacher of the people). During the Yugoslav-Albanian honeymoon many Albanian teachers were granted fellowships in Belgrade (and the Serbo-Croat language was introduced in Albanian schools by visiting Yugoslav instructors). But since 1948, the Russian language has been introduced into all secondary schools. The High Pedagogical Institute has a department of Russian language and Literature headed by a Soviet educator, Olga Smirnova. Russian language courses are offered in various industrial plants by Soviet instructors. Most Albanian students wanting to study abroad are allowed to go to the Soviet Union, or to other People's Democracies.

Adult Education

The Russification program is also promoted by the Albanian-Soviet Friendship Society (founded in 1945) which made its influence felt after 1948 and claims some 210,000 members, in 3,200 local branches; it sponsors each September the "Albanian-Soviet Friendship Month." Its appeal in rural areas comes from the showing by mobile movie projectors, donated by the permanent representative in Tirana of the Russian All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (VOKS), of all kinds of propaganda movies.

The government has been straining itself to promote all other forms of adult education among the rebellious subjects. There are twelve daily newspapers and fourteen periodicals published; about 83,000 copies are issued daily, with the leading newspaper accounting for 25,000. The Albanian Telegraph Agency (governmentally controlled) supplies the country's newspapers and radio stations with material. The Albanian Radio is a state system, operating seven transmitters. The forty-kilowatt Radio Tirana station was opened in 1952; the local stations at Stalin Town (Kucove), Korcha,

Gjirokastr, Shkoder, and Vlore are operated by the Committee on Radio Broadcasting, since 1955 under the Council of Ministers as the Directorate of Radio Broadcasting. There are only some 17,000 radio sets in Albania (since there is no electric current in many rural areas); the regime uses loud-speakers in town squares and in work centers, and battery-operated sets in villages.

The home broadcasting day is divided into three parts, starting at 5 A.M., and ending 7:30 A.M.; the broadcasts are resumed at 1 P.M. for 2 hours and then again in the evening from 3:30 until 11 P.M. The broadcasting formula is news, music, political indoctrination, descriptions of Russian achievements, and tedious programs devoted to special meetings, parades, and congresses. Before going to work, the early-morning Albanian listeners may participate in morning gymnastics, have the day's editorial from the Party organ *Zeri i popullit* read to him, and may listen to music.⁶

The theaters and movie houses are all government-controlled and operated. A "People's Theater" in Tirana is run by a Soviet Director. In 1949-50, "thanks to the help of the Soviet Union," the Albanian film industry was given projectors, sound equipment, and cameras, and started to produce documentaries. In 1948-49, Ilya Kopalin shot there a technicolor documentary, "New Albania," which was smuggled into the United States by an Albanian special mission to the United Nations and shown in American-Albanian settlements. The first film studio, New Albania, was built near Tirana with Soviet help, in July 1952, and much of the work for the technicolor film *Skenderbeg* was done there (although the film was produced by Mosfilm in Moscow). No Western films are shown, only Russian ones and those from the People's Democracies.

Albania's youth is grouped in a large central organization, the Union of Working Youth Organization. Under its statutes (Chapter 11, Article 8), the purpose is "to further the general education of young people and to raise their political and cultural level." It has been especially active in the public literacy campaign. In 1947 it owned six weekly papers, over 310 Youth Houses, and 1,220 Pioneers' rooms; considerable attention is paid to physical education and cadet training. The Working Youth controls Albanian Pioneers, a communist organization for all children from seven to fourteen years of age. The Union is also assisted

by the Red Workers, who promoted "socialist culture" in co-operatives, offices, plants, and schools.

Party Education. Before the Tito-Stalin break, Tirana took its orders from Belgrade. Hence it was only in 1949 that a Central Party School was organized in Tirana to train good Communists for party leadership and for work in the government and unions. The curriculum, featuring Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist teachings, the history of the Bolshevik Party and of the Albanian Worker's Party, and participation in active propaganda work, imitated similar schools in the satellite regions. (Cultural-educational work is also carried on by the professional unions.)

Notes

1. For details, see UNESCO, World Survey of Education: Handbook of Educational Organization and Statistics (Paris, 1955), pp. 62-63. Some supplementary information can be found in UNESCO, International Yearbook of Education, XVII (1955) (Paris, 1956, No. 169), 58-62; Albanie, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Section de presse, L'Instruction publique dans l'Albanie nouvelle (Tirana, 1948); and Conseil General de la jeunesse populaire d'Albanie, L'Education, principale tâche de la jeunesse populaire d'Albanie (Tirana, 1947).
2. Speech by Dhori Samsuri, General Inspector of Albanian Secondary Schools, January 7, 1952, reported in "Pragmatic Approach to Culture," News from Behind the Iron Curtain, I, ii (February 1952), 37.
3. Dhori Samsuri, loc. cit. See also "From Discipline to Diversion," News from Behind the Iron Curtain, II, iii (March 1953), 48; Stavro Skendi, ed., Albania (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1956), p. 17 and section "Education," pp. 269-284; and in S. D. Kertesz, ed., The Fate of East Central Europe (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), Stavro Skendi, "Albania," pp. 12, 297-321, "Education and Scholarship: General Remarks," pp. 568-576, and "Culture," pp. 576-580.
4. No statistics are available, and Albania is not listed in UNESCO'S Basic Facts and Figures (Paris, 1956), p. 13, the section showing the percentages of illiteracy throughout the world.
5. "From Discipline to Diversion," News from Behind the Iron Curtain, II, iii (March 1953), 48.
6. "Captive Communications," News from Behind the Iron Curtain, I, vii (July 1952), 36.

REVIEWS

Francis Dvornik. The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization. Boston, Mass.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956. 394 pp., \$6.00.

Francis Dvornik, whose works on the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission occupy a prominent position in Slavic historical literature, gives us in this book a lucid and exhaustive account of the rise and crisis of medieval Slavdom. He thereby not only fills a gap in English literature on early Slavic history, but for the first time treats this subject within the broader framework of Western and Byzantine civilization. The ample annotations, maps, and bibliography make his study an excellent handbook for students and a reference book for scholars. The neatness and clarity of the exposition enable a wider public to gain a better understanding of the Slavic world and of the historical background which accounts for much of the later growth and aspirations of the Slavs.

The titles of the twelve chapters (presented here in a shortened and slightly modified version) give a fair idea of the scope of this book: (1) Origins and Migrations of the Slavs, (2) Primitive Slavic Civilization, (3) the First Slavic State, (4) the Moravian Mission, (5) the Rise of Bohemia and Poland, (6) the Southern Slavs, (7) Old Slavonic Culture and Literature, (8) Kievan Russia, (9) the Slavs at the Crossroads, (10) the Slavs, the Empire, and the Papacy, (11) the Baltic and Polabian Slavs, (12) the Westernization of Poland and Bohemia.

Besides covering the political, social, and cultural aspects of medieval Slavic history, in the light of up-to-date research, the book is full of original insights and ideas. Of special interest are the remarks concerning Byzantine influence on Moravian art and architecture, the discussion of the early rise of Croatian cities, and the references to the Turkic origin of early Bulgarian art. Dvornik's view of the destruction of Illyricum as the bridge between the East and the West (which complements Pirenne's theory on the Arab encroachment in the Mediterranean), his presentation of the cultural relations between the Western and Eastern Slavs after the schism of 1054, and his exposition of the role of the Patriarch Photius during the Moravian Mission—all provide a better understanding of the European scene before the final rift between the East and West and of the role played by the Slavs in this crucial moment in European history.

Reservations can be raised, however, with respect to some of the theories advanced or too uncritically accepted by Dvornik, such as the theory of the Iranian, and particularly

Sarmatian, influence upon the Slavs. Not only does the author credit the Iranians with the impact they had on primitive Slavic religion, but he also detects Sarmatian influence in early Dalmatian architecture, exaggerates the role of the Antes (whose ethnic identity is by no means established as Iranian) in shaping the political and social organization of the Slavs, and ascribes the Southern expansion of the Slavs to the Serbs and the Croats, who were, in his opinion, Sarmatian tribes. In doing so, he ignores the views of scholars (such as Brückner, Otrębski, Lehr-Splawinski) who have adduced some evidence that the Serbs and Croats have Slavic origins. Likewise, Dvornik accepts the long since refuted theory of the Khazar origin of Eastern Jewry, the view about the special receptivity of the Slavs to foreign religions, the hypothesis of Zathely on the preserved cult of Gorazd in Poland, where it might have, after all, been imported in the fourteenth century, and the view on the post-Glagolitic and one-man creation of the Cyrillic alphabet (which view was recently questioned by Georgiev).

The author's philosophical bent comes to the fore in some of his comments concluding various chapters. It is hard to go along with him when he deplores the failure of the Roman rulers to Romanize Germania like Gaul, or when he tries to make us believe that the decline of Bavaria and the subsequent Saxon leadership of the Regnum Teutonicorum led to modern Prussian militarism, or that rivalry over Silesia ultimately drove the Poles and the Czechs into bondage to their powerful neighbors. The abundance of such remarks gives this profoundly learned and informative book a slightly speculative tinge. Some of the linguistic statements lack clarity or accuracy. Dvornik says that the Rumanian language has a majority of Slavic words, but fails to explain why "in spite of this the Vlachs were not Slavicized," and he misleadingly asserts that "all works in Kievan Russia were written in the vernacular." Slavic forms are sometimes misquoted; such as Pol. piorun instead of piorun, I-E. dieus instead of djeu-, C.Sl. jendrŭ instead of jedrŭ, svent instead of svetŭ.

Despite these objections, Dvornik's book is an outstanding contribution to our knowledge of early Slavic history and civilization.

Edward Stankiewicz
Indiana University

O. Georgij Šavel'skij. Vospominanija poslednego protopresvitera Russkoj armii i flota. 2 vols. New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1954. 414, 412 pp., \$3.00 each vol.

Among the books dealing with the twilight of Tsarist Russia a special place belongs to the memoirs of Fr. Georgij Šavel'skij. Of very humble beginnings (the son of a village priest and himself connected for years with village parishes) Šavel'skij, thanks to his great talents as priest and administrator, made a brilliant career. In 1911 at the age of 40, after having demonstrated his acumen both as professor of theology and as

military chaplain in the Russo-Japanese War, he was made Chief Chaplain of the Russian Army and Navy, a post which he held until the collapse of the Empire in 1917.

These memoirs embrace three periods: the years which preceded the outbreak of World War I, World War I, and the period of the Civil War after the advent of the Bolsheviks to power. Although the many chapters dedicated to the World War I period are of paramount importance—very few persons occupied such a vantage position as that held by the author—the other sections of the memoirs have also a considerable historical value. Very enlightening are Fr. Šavel'skij's description of his inspection tours which before the war in his official capacity took him to Siberia, Central Asia, the Caucasus, and other regions of Russia. They give evidence of the rapid economic and cultural strides made by the country, a progress which was on the whole spontaneous and was curtailed and brought to a halt eventually by political maladministration and the ensuing military catastrophe.

Fr. Šavel'skij spent the years of World War I at the headquarters of the Supreme Commander of Russia's Armed Forces. Because of his position he had an unusual opportunity to observe the working of the exclusive inner circle which surrounded, first, Grand Duke Nicholas and, later, the Tsar after he had taken over the Supreme Command in September 1915. How close he was to them is well illustrated by one detail: during all the war years he belonged to the foursome who regularly took their meals at the table of the Supreme Commander. It is hardly possible to find in the large collection of memoirs dealing with the last years of the Romanov dynasty a book which conveys its tragic doom with greater poignancy than that of Fr. Šavel'skij. Šavel'skij's book is much more valuable than the memoirs of Commander A. Bubnov, *V tsarskoj stavke* (Chekhov Publishing House, 1955). One of the flag officers on the staff of the Supreme Commander of the Russian Armed Forces during World War I, Bubnov stood on the sideline and observed the weakness of Russia's war policies only from a distance.

It is understandable that in the story of the system's unrelenting disintegration which progressed almost from day to day, a great deal of attention is given to Rasputin. In spite of the fact that so much has been written about him and his role during the years of World War I, the many pages of Fr. Šavel'skij devoted to him are of great interest and value, since they contain many new details. The reader watches a fantastic procession of corrupt and spineless cabinet members, an endless parade of hapless and inept military leaders, constant intrigues between the Petersburg authorities and the military headquarters, and the vapid routine of daily life in the nerve center of an empire in its tragic hour. As a member of the Holy Synod, Fr. Šavel'skij had a unique opportunity to observe the Russian Orthodox hierarchy, and he does not hesitate to portray in all their repulsive reality those princes of the church who owed their rank and position exclusively to the blessings of Rasputin. The student of church affairs in Russia in the last period of the old regime will find in this book valuable information about the near-sighted and cruel policy of the Government towards the

Uniates in Galicia during the occupation of this province by the Russian troops. Finally, very few witnesses of the era have left us more convincing characterizations of Nicholas II; written by a convinced and loyal monarchist, Šavel'skij delineation of the Tsar and his stubborn refusal to heed anyone's advice but his wife's has even more tragic overtones.

The last hundred pages of the work are devoted to the history of the disintegration of the White Movement; a certain sense of an inescapable tragic finale is conveyed by the author's description of the White Armies in the Civil War.

This reviewer was somewhat disturbed by the discovery of one strange flaw in Fr. Šavel'skij's account—an account which is consistently fair and objective (for instance, Fr. Šavel'skij draws in the same chapter parallel pictures of the Catholic Archbishop of Warsaw, Alexander Kakowski, an appealing and human prelate, and his Russian Orthodox counterpart, Archbishop Nikolaj, a repulsive maniac; it is obvious which of these two elicits the author's sympathy and respect). It is the more astounding that Fr. Šavel'skij did not find it necessary to raise his voice in protest against the fantastic accusations brought against the Jewish population in Russia's western provinces by General Januškevič and his clique in their efforts to find scapegoats for the disastrous failure of the military authorities in the conduct of the War. These biased mass persecutions of a large national minority and the resulting deportation of large numbers of innocent people were sharply criticized even by many conservative members of the Cabinet. Fr. Šavel'skij, who observed this anti-Semitic campaign from a first row seat, certainly must have known the motives behind it, and his condemnation should have been a matter of record.

After the end of the Civil War, Fr. Šavel'skij emigrated to Bulgaria, where he first was active as an ordinary priest and later became professor of theology at the University of Sofia and director and spiritual head of the Russian Gymnasium in the Bulgarian capital. He died in 1951.

Michael Ginsburg
Indiana University

Matthew Spinka. The Church in Soviet Russia. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. xi, 179, \$3.25.

Dr. Spinka does not intend to give in his book a complete or comprehensive picture of church life in the Soviet Union. He singles out for his study only a particular, though major, topic. He writes as a church historian. He is interested mainly in the attitude of Russian ecclesiastical authorities to the new political regime, which was inaugurated in Russia by the October Revolution in 1917. Ultimately, he wants to understand and to interpret the "strange alliance" which has obtained in Soviet Union since World War II. The situation is, in fact, utterly ambiguous and complex. On the one hand, by law and in principle, there is a sharp and radical "separation" between

Church and State, or rather between religion and the Soviet state. On the other hand, there is an actual policy, or tactics, of "co-operation" between the State and the institutional Church. One cannot avoid the question whether a church can exist in a Godless state, as a part of a comprehensive totalitarian system. Obviously, the Church should neither reconcile herself to the anti-religious State, nor engage in any "counter-revolutionary" activities. What then should be her practical attitude, her working program? Dr. Spinka sees the problem. And his own contention is that in the present "strange alliance" the basic "autonomy" of the Church has been surrendered and sorely compromised. The factual "co-operation" is no more than subservience to the ultimate *raison d'état*. The Church has been, as it were, reintegrated into the structure of Soviet society, because she has been given certain political assignments and, obviously, under the condition that these assignments be actually carried out. Dr. Spinka tells his story in three consecutive chapters, with suggestive titles: "Patriarch Tikhon's Struggle for Church Autonomy" (3-50), "Patriarch Sergei Capitulates to Save the Church" (51-100), "Patriarch Alexei's 'Strange Alliance'" (101-156).

The narrative is based on the primary sources, and the analysis of facts and events is fair and impartial. Now, the very character of the sources makes impartiality rather precarious. In fact, the student of the Russian situation has to operate either with the official documents, which very often amount to special pleading, even without disguise, or with the documents of the "opposition," often anonymous and sometimes carefully disguised. All sources are inevitably "committed." Nor can the approach of the interpreter be simply "noncommittal." The "criticism" of the documents itself implies a certain "commitment," a certain point of view. Dr. Spinka reserves his final judgment on the situation, but he does not conceal his apprehensions. Patriarch Tikhon was compelled to make certain concessions, but his only purpose was to "save the Church." His ultimate aim was to secure "autonomy" for the Church, in her own realm, in the realm of her intrinsic competence and responsibility. Metropolitan Sergij went much further, especially after World War II began. Dr. Spinka does not spell out his decisive reasons adequately. It was in the field of "national feeling" that an "alliance" between the Church and the State has been actually established. The Church has been granted recognition, and later even support, as a "national institution." Patriarch Aleksij, and his main companion, Metropolitan Nikolaj, are fully committed to the "national cause," with whatever this cause may imply or call for. It is at this point that the major question, and the major anxiety, inevitably arise. To what extent should a church be committed to "the national cause"? The ambiguity of the Soviet situation is increased by the fact that the State does not resign from its basic "Godless commitment," and in its support of the "National Church" does not grant her any true "autonomy," precisely because of her inherent "national" commitment. At the present, even a critical historian is bound to take sides, if his interpretation is to be intelligent and conscientious. Any increase in "religious freedom" should be welcome. But the

ambiguity of the situation must be frankly and honestly admitted. Dr. Spinka supplies the reader with reliable information and also with certain hints which would help him in the appraisal and assessment of the factual material. Of course, it is not yet the last word on the subject. Yet the subject itself continuously changes in shape and character.

Georges Florovsky
Harvard Divinity School

John N. Hazard. The Soviet System of Government. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957. xi, 256, \$4.00.

Professor Hazard has given us a very brief survey of Soviet political institutions, their history, and the myths with which the rulers have surrounded and rationalized them. All scholarly apparatus except a skimpy bibliography is omitted. The volume's organization is clear, and, despite some turgid sentences, the book is readable. For these reasons it is well suited for beginning undergraduates in courses on Soviet government or as supplementary readings in elementary courses on comparative government.

The treatment is perhaps a bit uneven. Plenty of space has been given to laws and the court system, but not even an attempt has been made to describe or guess how and where laws are made. There are occasional hints about a latent struggle between the party and the managerial elite, but not enough is said about social stratification. In particular, the author has not attempted to single out a ruling class. He should, however, be congratulated for having included a chapter dealing with the employer-employee relationship of government and citizens. On the whole, the contribution of the book lies in its attempt to view Soviet government in its impact on the citizenry, and not to confine its treatment here to the more brutal aspects of government in the U.S.S.R. Compared with other texts in the field, this book is far more elementary, but perhaps more lively.

Mr. Hazard's main thesis is that Soviet government has been falsely or misleadingly represented by other political scientists as a totalitarian monolith surrounded by democratic rhetoric. Instead, he says it should be described as a system in which democratic forms are subject to totalitarian counterweights. The several reasons the author gives for laying this conceptual gridwork on his tableau of Soviet government are not convincing. His view is but a reversal of the one he condemns. Both views, however, fashion a rather naive and dogmatic model of the political process. Both are preoccupied with problems of control, the only difference being that the "monolithic" view tends to dismiss the rhetoric as irrelevant.

Professor Hazard takes the ideology more seriously; but in this, too, he is not convincing. For instance, he explains Soviet totalitarianism by the idea of leadership (which he wrongly ascribes to Marx). This idea, he says, is potent because the leaders do not trust the people "to choose wisely."

He sadly comments that "Khrushchev and his colleagues have exhibited no faith in Burke . . ."

Certain Soviet myths are accepted at face value. The *ežovščina*, for instance, is interpreted as an instance of the N.K.V.D.'s "exceeding its authority" and "overdoing its assignment" (p. 64). Stalin's rationalization of the terror is adduced, ostensibly to show why Soviet citizens accept the terror. But do they? Obliquely, and perhaps unintentionally, Professor Hazard implies that the membership of the C.P.S.U. is a representative cross section of the population. Why else would he have picked a worker, a clerk, and a chicken farm brigadier as examples of rank-and-file party members? (p. 32.)

Focusing his sight on the "democratic forms," Professor Hazard dances a gingerly dance of the eggs around the oppressive features of Soviet government. Like the monolithic school he criticizes, he therefore misses the chance of devising a model of Soviet government in which democracy, tyranny, and several other features of this system fall into their functional places. Such a book has yet to be written.

Alfred G. Meyer
Michigan State University

G. A. Tokaev. Soviet Imperialism. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 73 pp., \$2.75.

The title of this book is misleading. It is an essay, not on imperialism, but on facts concerning Soviet military and industrial organization, plus some generalizations on Soviet strategy. This material was compiled by E. S. Virpsha and E. Sykes from various published lectures of Engineer Colonel Tokaev, a defector from Soviet Russia. The editors "deliberately shortened" the parts of the original lectures which dealt with Soviet military, political, and military philosophical doctrine—precisely the part that would have told Western readers about the motivations behind Soviet imperialism. What remains is a collection of facts, most of which are familiar to attentive readers of Western newspapers, plus a few statements of the author's opinion, as, for instance: "We should dismiss as false the idea prevalent in many Western countries that Russia never initiates an offensive war." The most puzzling question about this little book is: Why did the Philosophical Library see fit to include it in its list of publications?

Gerhart Niemeyer
University of Notre Dame

Boris Meissner. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Party Leadership, Organization and Ideology. Edited and with a chapter on the Twentieth Party Congress by John S. Reshetar, Jr. Translations by Fred Holling. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1956. 276 pp., \$5.00.

This book bears a deceptive heading. It makes no survey of the subject; it is all appendices, so to speak. Though Boris Meissner is a leading German student of Soviet politics, his contribution here on the Nineteenth Party Congress and the succession to Stalin (exactly twenty-one pages of text, not counting the chunks of the Party Statutes with which it is interlarded) is a chaotic nullity. Even the editor apparently could not understand Mr. Meissner; sub-title headings have been used where the logic calls for main ones, and vice versa. John Reshetar's résumé of the Twentieth Congress is unexciting but competent, at least by contrast. (Unfortunately, his discussion has not been revised to take account of Khrushchev's secret speech, though the book was not published until November 1956.)

Assembled in the rest of the book are the following miscellany: lists of the central committees, presidia, etc., of the Communist Parties of all the Union Republics; the full Party Statutes; Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR"; F. Jakovlev on "Collectivity of Leadership" (*Kommunist*, No. 11, July, 1953); the editorial of *Voprosy istorii*, No. 3, 1956, "The Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and the Tasks of Investigating the History of the Party."

Robert V. Daniels
University of Vermont

Zbigniew Folejewski. Studies in Modern Slavic Poetry, I. (Publications de l'Institut slave d'Upsal, XI.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1955. 64 pp.

This group of essays is concerned mainly with modern Polish poetry. The opening essay, "Esenin and Maiakovskii as Antipodes in Russian Post-Revolutionary Literature," centering on the different poetic responses of the two Russian poets to post-revolutionary Russia, forms a suggestive background to the essays that follow.

The essay on Esenin and Majakovskij, based on the conception of these poets as polarities in post-revolutionary Soviet Russia, shows how Esenin, lyric poet of old rural Russia, and Majakovskij, as proletarian poet of urban Russia, give expression to the "tension between the old and the new in post-revolutionary poetry." The language, style, and imagery of both poets, as Dr. Folejewski brings out, illustrate this tension. But the "tragic paradox" is "that although the two poets followed what seemed to be divergent roads, they finally found themselves on one and the same road"; their suicides bring into sharp focus that tragic conflict between the poet and "social

command" which has played such havoc in the life and work of many Soviet writers.

The early writings of the remarkable Polish poet Broniewski ("A Proletarian Prometheus Bound—Władysław Broniewski," Chapter II) are contemporaneous with those of Majakovskij and Esenin; indeed, he seems to combine the intense revolutionary spirit and energy of a Majakovskij with the pure lyricism of a Esenin. A bitter sense of reality is also felt in his poetry. The story of Broniewski's life and poetry, as Dr. Folejewski writes, "is the individual but, at the same time, typical story of a modern European poet's victories and defeats." "The tragic course of a Polish revolutionary poet's life" is contained between the moment Broniewski writes in a Polish prison in 1931; and the moment, ten years later in a Soviet prison, when he writes:

A revolutionary poet
To rot in a Soviet prison?
Oh, history! It is tactless.
One of us must be a child!

"A Conversation with History" ("Rozmowa z historią")

The immediacy of Dr. Folejewski's response to the many-sided character of Broniewski's poetry sensitively brings out its strength and pathos.

In "Polish Poetry during the Last War" (Chapter III), Dr. Folejewski focuses the main themes and motifs of Polish poetry against the background of war, dislocation, and alienation. The selections from the poetry of the Polish "underground" are imbued with a poignant realism. The poetry of the emigration, less given to realistic description of war, abounds in pure lyricism "in which facts and memories are transformed into a new poetic reality and truth." Though for the most part traditional in form (with notable exceptions such as Tuwim and Łobodowski), this poetry gives contemporary expression to collective feelings and thoughts, to the waves of hopes, fears, bitterness, and anger which moved the Polish emigration during the war. Embracing so wide a field, Dr. Folejewski's essay is not intended to give detailed stylistic analysis to any single poet, but is descriptive and gives a feeling for the continued vitality and quality of Polish poetry.

It was this creative stream that was interrupted by the political controls imposed with increasing severity in the post-war years. Dr. Folejewski discusses the period (from 1945 to 1953) in his final chapter, "Poetry in Postwar Poland," and outlines the course of literary politics which compelled such a poet as Broniewski to write in 1950 that "the reaction of the public" caused him to revise his attitude and abjure "personal thematics." Dr. Folejewski's informative essay pictures the literary scene which was to be stirred again by the events of October 1956.

Studies in Modern Slavic Poetry, I, analyzes the poetry of a troubled period, discusses poets whose victories and

defeats give expression to some of the major conflicts and upheavals of the century.

Robert L. Jackson
Yale University

M. Karpovich and D. Čiževsky, eds. Russkij literaturnyj arxiv (Russian Literary Archives). New York, 1956. 239 pp., \$4.00.

This volume, published by the Harvard Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, jointly with the University Library, makes available to students of Russian literature a selection of manuscript materials, taken for the most part from the holdings of the Houghton Library. The materials are provided with an imposing learned apparatus prepared by several scholars. Professor Čiževsky edited a second version of Puškin's poem "To the Sea" (Proščaj, svobodnaja stixija!); two short letters of Gogol'; a fragment from a rough draft of Dostoevskij's Notes From the House of the Dead (Part II, Chapter II); and a series of thirty-seven letters and notes of Turgenjev to Nikolaj and Mar'ja Miljutin; seven of these are published for the first time, while the remainder was known, but in a defective and incomplete publication in Russkaja starina in 1884. Mr. George Ivask is the editor of two letters of Prince P. A. Vjazemskij to a French correspondent, dated 1823 and 1824, one hitherto unpublished; and of a series of letters addressed by Marina Cvetaeva to himself in the 1930's. Professor Hugh McLean prepared for publication two series of letters of Nikolaj Leskov: one to E. J. Dillon, the other to Olga Launert, who was to become the wife of Andrej Leskov, the writer's son and biographer. Mrs. E. Stenbock-Fermor supplied the commentary for a short letter of Aleksandr Blok. Finally, a poem by Majakovskij, Pis'mo Tat'jane — ož, together with several rhymed messages, dedications, etc., have been edited and annotated by Professor Roman Jakobson, whose essay, "A Commentary to Majakovskij's Late Lyrics," is appended to the texts.

Among the generally excellent contributions of the editors, one may mention Professor Čiževsky's commentary to Puškin's poem, actually an extensive essay, remarkable both for vast, judiciously used erudition, and for penetrating formal and thematic analysis. Leskov's letters to Dillon, a correspondent in Russia of the London Daily Telegraph, bring to light, with the aid of Professor McLean's introduction and notes, a curious if not especially dramatic episode, involving Tolstoj, the English journalist, and several other characters and publications, Russian and foreign; the materials show Tolstoj caught in a rather embarrassing situation out of which he was helped by Leskov, who guided him onto the path of justice (he persuaded Tolstoj to admit in writing that Dillon had done no wrong in publishing in England one of Tolstoj's articles). Leskov tells Dillon how overwhelmed he was by his "victory" over the great man, and concludes, quite appropriately, that

"all's well that ends well." Marina Cvetaeva's letters to Mr. Ivask, published in excerpts, are deeply moving. One senses in these pages all the vigor of her personality and of her style, her triumphant consciousness of her creative powers, her defiant refusal to surrender to adversity, and her proud loneliness. One is naturally tempted to draw a parallel between Cvetaeva's tragic end and that of Majakovskij. Majakovskij's "Letter to Tat'jana" (this is the first publication of the complete text of the poem) sheds new light on his last years and on the circumstances of his death. He was caught in several traps, and one of them was that, like Onegin in the last chapter, he loved Tat'jana, that Tat'jana lived in Paris, and that a soveckij passport, which he had sung not long before, was now refused to, in Stalin's no-longer-quoted phrase, "the best and the most talented poet of our Soviet epoch." The regular alternation of love themes with epic poetry in Majakovskij's work is brought out in Professor Jakobson's convincing and exceptionally brilliant essay.

Leon Stilman
Columbia University

Dmitrij Tschizewskij und Johann Schröpfer. Russische literarische Parodien. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, I.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957. 71 pp.

Dmitrij Tschizewskij und Johann Schröpfer. Berufung und Bestimmung des Dichters in der slavischen Dichtung, I: Von den Anfängen bis zur Romantik. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, II.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957. 45 pp.

This new series of Slavic texts has a pedagogical aim of providing students at the university level with basic texts on selected themes from Slavic literature. Since the majority of Slavists today specialize in Russian, the largest proportion of texts are to be Russian, but parallel examples from other Slavic literatures will also be included. Commentaries are purposely kept to the minimum so that the student may utilize his own method of interpretation.

Book I, The Russian Literary Parody contains fifty-seven selections in prose and verse ranging from a fragment of the Igor' Tale to poetry of the 1920's. Since the true literary parody in Russian literature developed only in the nineteenth century, most attention is directed to this period. Parodists and parodied authors include such writers as Puškin, Lermontov, Dostoevskij, and Gogol'. Minaev and Koz'ma Prutkov, as the leading parodists of the nineteenth century, are represented by ten and seven selections, respectively. Though space limitations made it impossible to include the better known parodies of Russian realists, such as Dostoevskij's parody of Turgenev in Besy, a page of commentary lists the most important works, and indicates sources for further study. The importance of parody as a tool for the study of literary style is most

strikingly demonstrated by three parody cycles reprinted from the book Parnass dybom (Xar'kov, 1925) in which variants of a basic poem are presented as they would have been written by the different poets. One cycle has renderings à la Krylov, Nekrasov, Brjusov, Blok, Axmatova, Majakovskij, Mandel'stam, and Demjan Bednyj. A brief bibliography, and an index to the parodists and the parodied authors are included. More careful editing could have avoided some confusion. Selection 24 has been omitted altogether, Selection 43 should have been included under the symbolists, and Koz'ma Prutkov is not properly indexed.

Book II deals with the vocation and destiny of the poet in Slavic poetry from the beginnings through Romanticism. The division of selections is based on the literary-historical approach already utilized by Čiževskij in his Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures, thus making it particularly suitable for use in conjunction with the Outline. The earliest period is represented by excerpts from the Igor' Tale, and a sermon by Kiril of Turov; the Renaissance, by Kochanowski; the Baroque, by Kochowski, Potocki, Petrov, and Lomonosov; Classicism, by Sumarokov, Krasicki, and Karamzin, who is indicated as a transitional figure on the path to Romanticism. Approximately half the texts are taken from the period of Romanticism. The most famous representatives of the respective national groups are included and apportioned as follows: eight Russians beginning with Žukovskij, three Poles, two Ukrainians, one Slovak, two Czechs, one Slovene, and two Serbs. German translations of many poems give the beginner or the non-Slavist the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the material. English translations would, of course, make such a volume more valuable in this country and accessible even to undergraduates in comparative literature courses and in Slavic literature courses given in translation. Book II will undoubtedly enjoy more widespread use than Book I because its subject matter is more basic, and because it does not require the same depth of knowledge. Book I presupposes a fairly good knowledge of Russian poetry and Russian literary styles.

This new series fills a most important need in the Slavic Studies. It will be most useful if, as in Book II, texts from all the Slavic literatures can be included. Subjects listed for future volumes include the poetics of Russian Symbolism, Slavic literary manifestoes, and texts dealing with individual recurring themes in the various Slavic literatures such as autumn leaves, fireworks, the forsaken home, the labyrinth, and translations of foreign literatures, such as for example, Gray's Elegy.

Leon I. Twarog
Boston University

W. H. Bruford, Anton Chekhov. (Studies in Modern European Literature and Thought.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. 62 pp., \$2.50.

Professor Bruford, who is known to lovers of Russian literature as the author of a valuable sociological interpretation of Čexov's work (Chekhov and His Russia, London, 1947), has presented in this volume a more general, but unfortunately all too condensed, study of Čexov. The work, which is one of a series of monographs devoted to inquiries into leading figures of European literature and thought, treats in rapid fashion Čexov's humorous stories, his mature prose, as well as his plays. It is a practically impossible task to present in so short a space (a mere 59 pages of text) a complete picture of so complex and prolific an artist as was Čexov. In general, Professor Bruford's approach is historical rather than critical. He gives us a broad outline of Čexov's development as a writer, using, however, only isolated examples of works to show the artistic evolution.

It should be noted, however, that whenever the author enters into critical analyses of individual works, he does so with great skill and insight. It is unfortunate that he has been unable to develop further some of his most interesting ideas, such as his comparison of Čexov's use of time with that of classical French drama and his suggestions of the many elements evocative of Greek drama in Čexov's later plays. As it is, this volume remains primarily an introduction and it could not be more, considering the limitations of space imposed by the exigencies of the series of which it is one. Within this framework it is a useful contribution.

Thomas G. Winner
Duke University

M. V. Vishniak. "Sovremennye zapiski": Vospominaniia re-daktora. (Slavic and East European Series, VII.) Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1957. 334 pp., \$4.00.

Mark Veniaminovich Vishniak is primarily what is designated by the untranslatable Russian term obščestvennyj deiatel'. "Public figure" and "statesman" only partially cover the term because, owing to the peculiar Russian conditions of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, those "statesmen" or "public figures" frequently found themselves in prison or in Siberian exile for the reason of their devotion to the principles of democracy. By education, Vishniak is a jurist, a theoretician of law; by occupation, at present a journalist—he is a contributing editor of Time magazine; in the past, an active revolutionist, a member of the party of Social-Revolutionists; and, for about two decades during his Parisian exile, the editor of the most influential review in the Russian language outside of Russia, Sovremennye

zapiski" (Contemporary Notes). It is in this last capacity that Vishniak has become known to the wide circles of Russian emigration. In the present volume he endeavors to present the history, as reflected through his subjective impressions, of the origin, genesis, and ultimate demise of that important Russian cultural landmark.

As M. Ginsburg of the Department of Slavic Languages at Indiana University states in the Introduction, "During twenty years (1920-1940) this review played a role which has no precedent in the annals of Russian journalism, the role of a cultural center which had united around itself almost all prominent representatives of the Russian intelligentsia in exile.... In the present volume, the author of the memoirs presents a living chronicle of the growth of Sovremennye zapiski; the reader will find in it the history of the publication and the vivid portraits of many of its contributors.... M. V. Vishniak's memoirs ... represent a most valuable contribution to the literature about Russian intelligentsia during one of the most difficult and heroic periods of its history."

The publication of the book was made possible by a generous support from the Humanities Fund.

In addition to the extremely interesting and, at times, dramatic account of the trials and tribulations of the publication which was struggling for its very survival during the time of its existence, the book contains photographs of the five men who were most intimately and directly concerned with its life. The are, in addition to M. V. Vishniak, V. V. Rudnev, I. I. Fondaminsky-Bunakov, A. I. Gukovsky, and N. D. Avksentiev. Not one of them was a magazine editor by vocation.

To this reviewer, the most fascinating thing about this account, and about the publication itself, is the fact that the editors—with Mr. Vishniak as the foremost example—did such a splendid job of keeping the review functioning on its high level without money, with experience, and without, even, a previously exhibited interest in that type of venture. The whole story of Sovremennye zapiski is a monument to the resourcefulness and sense of responsibility to Russian culture on the part of the best elements of Russian intelligentsia in exile. Every person who is able to read Russian, and who holds the principles of Russian culture dear, will find in this account a source of inspiration and of hope for the future of Russia.

J. A. Posin
Stanford University

Vladimir Dudintsev. Not by Bread Alone. Tr. by Dr. Edith Bone. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1957. 512 pp., \$4.95.

Dutton is to be congratulated on the decision to publish Dr. Edith Bone's thoroughly adequate translation of Not by Bread Alone. This is a good book. The fact that its social content created a sensation in the Soviet Union has tended to obscure or render suspect its intrinsic literary merits. Certainly

Dudincev's novel has its faults. One might, for instance, wish that Professor Bus'ko, though he undoubtedly fulfils a certain function, had been left out entirely. Lopatkin may be felt to be over-idealized. A certain awkwardness of construction fails, perhaps, at times to make full use of the possibilities inherent in the story. For instance, the incident in which Antonovič saves Lopatkin's file from the flames is told twice. On the first occasion the reader, unaware of Antonovič's intentions, is led to believe that the file has been destroyed; and the description seems unnecessarily long. On the second occasion the explanation of what really happened is given in a flash-back; but the reader now knows the outcome and all element of suspense is lost. This is a trick which Dostoevskij, one feels, would not have missed.

But these and other minor shortcomings do not detract from the novel's many qualities. Technical details are well handled. In some Soviet stories technical details exuberate promiscuously and pointlessly. Dudincev has avoided this pitfall. His technical details, which are after all inevitable in a novel revolving around a pipe-casting machine, have been skilfully subordinated to artistic intention. They have become essential parts of the plot. They move the story along; they are inextricably interwoven with human emotions, ambitions, vices; and they are used to create mystery and suspense. An excellent example of the effective use of technical detail is the description of the meeting at the Institute of Projects when Lopatkin's machine is turned down.

Also successful is Dudincev's characterization of Nadja. She serves as a sort of central thread and key to the story. When the reader meets her at the outset, she is spellbound by Drozdov's worldly wisdom and materialist outlook. Long before the end she shares Lopatkin's not-by-bread-alone philosophy—always basically more akin to her own. Dudincev has succeeded in penetrating unpretentiously but efficiently into her psychology. Her loyalty to and admiration for Drozdov, her questions which Drozdov fails to answer, the impact on her of Valentina Pavlovna, the problem posed in her mind by Lopatkin, her growing sense of alienation from Drozdov, the inconsistent and self-contradictory emotions and actions provoked by these conflicts—all this is described with understanding. The character of Nadja is, we may note, very much in keeping with the nineteenth-century Russian literary tradition.

On the interesting and controversial figure of Drozdov space permits me to make only one point. Dudincev has avoided the temptation of painting his main bureaucrat all black. This is, of course, sociologically significant, since Drozdov thereby emerges not as an isolated villain but as a normal individual playing his role with maximum skill in a system which he accepts but has not created. But this blending of the colors is also good writing.

It is to be hoped that the fact that *Not by Bread Alone* has appeared five weeks on the *New York Times* best-seller list will encourage publishers to bring out translations of other contemporary Soviet works. Much of what is being written would have little appeal for the Western reader, but there is also much that not only gives an insight into Soviet life but,

like Dudincev's novel, though not epoch-making, does just make plain good reading.

Walter Vickery
Harvard University

Haralds Biezais. *Die Hauptgöttinnen der alten Letten*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1955. xii, 435.

The present book, on the principal goddesses of the Ancient Letts, was written by a Lettish scholar, at present a professor at the University of Uppsala. It was a thesis for the doctorate, which was conferred in 1955.

In the Introduction the author shows his critical attitude toward earlier attempts at reconstructing a pre-Christian mythology from folk belief and folk poetry. He nevertheless considers that traditional poetry, incantations and legends, and, to a lesser extent, folk customs, and whatever documentary evidence of an earlier date may be available, provide sources sufficient to determine the characteristics of the pagan Lettish goddesses, and perhaps also of the general character of Lettish paganism.

The main source is the Lettish folksong, the *daina*, a form having a four-lined stanza, making a brief observation of a rather general type, and following it with some pertinent commentary. These short songs are, in the main, lyrics, and therefore possible vestiges of paganism must be sought in a name, an epithet, or in some briefly indicated situation. *A priori* one would hardly expect to discover vestiges of mythology in folk poetry of this type, at least comparing the *daina* with related oral traditional songs of a similar type elsewhere, such as, for example, the Norwegian *stev* or the Spanish *copla*. The defense of the use of the *daina* as such a source must rest upon the fairly recent date of the transition from paganism to the Christian faith in Latvia.

The book makes no attempt at a reconstruction of the complete system of Lettish paganism. The main interest is concentrated upon three enigmatic figures, possibly goddesses — Laima, Māra, and Dekla — most often referred to in the songs. The name Laima is found in documents from the early seventeenth century, with the interpretation *mater bonae fortunae*. In close connection with Laima, Māra is often mentioned. Māra, according to the author, is a reflex of Mary the Holy Virgin of medieval folk belief, a result of a syncretism of Roman Catholic and indigenous elements. The evidence and reasoning are convincing, as is also his identification of Dekla with Saint Thecla; the geographical correspondence between Dekla's appearance in the *daina* and the province where the German clergy was especially active in introducing the cult of Saint Thecla is striking.

Thus the main interest rests with Laima. Her name is also found in Lithuanian folk songs, but not in Livonian or Estonian folk poetry. Biezais seeks a parallel in the

mythology of Germanic peoples, and he interprets her as a Goddess of Fate (Schicksalgöttin). However, it may be objected that the very term Goddess of Fate involves a contradiction in terms. Fate and its representatives seem, at least to me, not to be of the nature of a deity. In Norse mythology the three Norns are not gods; they stand apart and none knows their pedigree, though both the gods and man are subject to their decree. A belief in all-decisive fate is probably found with most Germanic peoples, but no definite diety of fate seems to be known.

A short review cannot do justice to a book of this kind, which introduces its readers to a world which only a few specialists have any knowledge of. The documentation is sufficient to give Western readers an idea of the daina, and in the discussion the author's train of reasoning constantly leads on to problems of far wider implications.

Reidar Th. Christiansen
Oslo University

A. A. Šaxmatov and P. A. Lavrov, eds. Sbornik^{II} XII veka Moskovskago Uspenskago sobora, Vol. I. Photomechanischer Nachdruck mit einer Einführung von Dmitrij Čiževskij. (Apophoreta Slavica, I.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co, 1957. xi, 167.

This book is a photomechanical reprint of a work published in Moscow fifty-eight years ago, in 1899, in the famous collection of texts and monographs Čtenija v Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete; a very limited number of separate copies was published at the same time.

The book scheduled for publication by the Obščestvo istorii i drevnostej represented a manuscript found in the papers of A. Popov, the former secretary of the Obščestvo. It was a copy from a Sbornik (i.e., a volume containing different writings) found in the library of the Moscow Cathedral of the Virgin's Assumption (Uspenskij Sobor) and written in the twelfth century (first half). The Sbornik counted 304 folios and was previously described by A. Popov in the bibliographical materials of the Čtenija of 1880 (Book I). A. Šaxmatov prepared for print 99 folios in 1888-89, and his work was continued by P. Lavrov in 1897-98, who carried it as far as folio 115. These 115 folios formed the fascicle, the reprint of which is offered to us now. The continuation of the publication was planned, but never carried out. One of the difficulties at the time lay in the refusal of the Holy Synod to send the original manuscript to St. Petersburg where both Šaxmatov and Lavrov moved. Out of the unpublished material, parts were published separately by A. Popov (1879) and A. Sobolevskij (1913), as indicated in Professor Čiževsky's Preface.

The published fascicle I contains the following writings: The Tale of Prophet Jeremiah; The Life of St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria; Legend on the Holy Martyrs Boris

and Gleb; The Life of Saint Theodosius, Abbot of the Crypt; The Martyrdom of Saint Irene; Memory of Saint Job; Saint Job's Reading and Memory; The Appearance of the Glorious Cross; The Vision of the Holy Prophet Isaiah; The Martyrdom of Saint Christopher; Life of Saint Methodius, Archbishop of Moravia; and Eulogy of Saint Cyril and Saint Methodius, First Teachers of the Slavs.

Professor Čiževsky analyses the content of the Sbornik in a Preface rich in pertinent remarks. In it, he points out that it was above all an attempt to compose a Slav Čet'i Minei (i.e., spiritual readings, arranged by days of the month) for the month of May. That is why, besides the two most important Kievan hagiographical texts, the Boris and Gleb Legend and Saint Theodosius' Life, we find there Saint Methodius' "Pannonian" Life and Saint Cyril's Eulogy, which are pieces of old all-Slav literature. These four texts are given to us in the Sbornik in their oldest existing versions. This fact underlines the importance of this publication. In addition, the Uspenskij Sbornik provides us with a rich source for studying the Russian language of the twelfth century.

Time, together with the ravages of political bias, made it so that the manuscript of the Uspenskij Sbornik was not preserved in its full integrity. Professor Čiževsky, in his Preface, has reconstructed some of the missing passages (one of these reconstructions replaced a torn-out page).

The edition as reprinted shows much care, inspite of isolated misprints in both Prefaces.

Marc Szeftel
Cornell University

W. K. Matthews. The Structure and Development of Russian.
Cambridge University Press, 1953. ix, 225, \$6.00.

The author, professor of Slavic and East European languages at the University of London, has published a book which could be used by a beginning graduate student in the English-speaking world setting out to study the history of the Russian language. The book, in three parts, starts out with a brief survey of the phonology and morphology of present-day Russian, complete with a necessarily cursory examination of that elusive sphere of contemporary linguistics known as syntax. A passing reference is also made to the chief dialects of present-day Russian, as well as to their main features.

The second part gives a summary of the history of present-day Russian, starting with the Church-Slavic and Kievan Rus' days down the post-Revolutionary period, while the last part contains a selection of passages from Russian literature. These passages contain the Russian text on one page, with the corresponding English translation on the facing page—a useful feature for the student. These passages start with the eleventh century and proceed through the chronicles of the Middle Ages, to Lomonosov, Deržavin, Puškin, down to present day Soloxov, Boris Pasternak, and Konstantin Simonov.

Perhaps the most useful feature of the book is the classified bibliography at the end, which could send the serious student in further search for answers which would necessarily arise in the course of perusal of this survey of the history of the Russian language.

Harry H. Josselson
Wayne State University

Dr. Eugene A. Carpovich. Russian-English Atomic Dictionary.
New York: Technical Dictionaires Co., 1957. 317 pp.,
\$12.00.

Since it is not so easy to set up a border-line between a dictionary and a glossary, it is difficult to say whether or not the Atomic Dictionary is a dictionary or a glossary. From my point of view, this Atomic Dictionary should be called, more appropriately, A Nuclear Physics Glossary. In this work, probably no more than fifteen to twenty percent of all entries are terms of nuclear physics or closely related fields of science. The remaining eighty to eighty-five percent of the terms pertain to general science (which is covered much more thoroughly by Ignatiev-Gallaham's Russian-English Technical and Chemical Dictionary), and many of these terms are compound words which are direct translation of corresponding compound English words. Any Russian-English dictionary or glossary of this type, however, is very welcome to any one working on Soviet scientific and technical material since there are so few in existence today. The dictionaries published by the U. S. Armed Forces are sometimes hard to obtain and the print is often difficult to read.

Dr. Carpovich's Atomic Dictionary is of considerable value as a supplement or reference to a basic dictionary for work in the field of nuclear physics. It is well organized, the print is clear and easy to read, the cross references are well-planned, and on the whole it is a good tool for a translator.

Every person who has worked with any foreign scientific material for a number of years has compiled glossaries for terms not to be found in existing dictionaries. When Dr. Austin M. Patterson revised the third edition of his German-English Chemical Dictionary (1950), he used my German-English glossary of steel heat-treatment terms, which I was glad to send him at his request. Because of the great importance of having adequate dictionaries and glossaries for research on Soviet technical and scientific material, surely no one will refuse to give a hand to a colleague, and with no strings attached. No mention was made by Dr. Carpovich of using such available help.

What is really needed today is a comprehensive Russian-English dictionary of up-to-date terms covering most of the fields of science and technology, similar to those available in German and other languages. Such a dictionary would greatly facilitate all work on Soviet scientific and technical material.

It is hoped that Technical Dictionaries Co. will attempt to produce such a publication.

Nicolas W. Baklanoff
Hernando, Florida

Ernest F. Haden and M. Irving Smith. How to Pronounce Russian. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1956. iv, 58 pp., with drawings, \$2.50.

This brief manual offers a succinct presentation of Russian pronunciation with systematic drills. The latter are illustrated on phonograph recordings which we have not been able to obtain.

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of this book is its direct style and economy of words. The authors were interested in driving home certain minimal concepts and were anxious not to confuse the learner by additional data. Their publisher has been most helpful in providing a large type-face that sets off the text to the best advantage. Judicious use of boldface and italic print makes the book the most legible of its kind in the Russian field.

Essential notions of general phonetics are presented in the first five pages, followed by the classical vowel triangle and a series of profile drawings indicating the articulation of Russian consonants with hard and soft vowels. The diagrams of vocal organs are of the same high quality as the type face.

A surprising item occurs on page 8, diagrams 4 and 5, showing non-palatalized *y* and *f* as labio-dental fricatives rather than bilabial fricatives. This pronunciation is undoubtedly justified by the recording of the native speaker.

Intonation is adequately discussed and is represented by the conventional Armstrong-Jones lines and dots indicating pitch. Intonations of the Russian phrases are given first with the English meanings and later with normal Russian spellings. This device could be used to imitate the melody of an untrained native Russian attempting to read English. The reviewer has found such imitations more vivid than a description of Russian intonation in simple contrast to English intonation patterns.

The present work obviously does not pretend to cover the same ground as Boyanus or Trofimov and Jones, but it could fill the gap created by an almost total absence of correct pronunciation chapters in current American manuals of the Russian language. Its handy format and flexible cloth cover are an additional feature. Although its price is a bit high, one feels that the book is a welcome addition to our current teaching materials for the Russian language.

C. P. Lemieux
U. S. Naval Academy

Horace G. Lunt. Kniga dlja čtenija: An Accented Russian Reader. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1957. vii, 152 pp.

This book consists of Pikovaja dama and Mednyj vsadnik by Puškin, Taman' by Lermontov, six short stories by Čexov, a vaudeville and a skit by Il'f and Petrov, a short story by L. Panteleev, and a few short poems by Puškin, Lermontov, Tjutčev, Blok, and Esenin. "This book ... is intended to provide the student who has completed an introductory course in Russian grammar with a fairly extensive body of Russian prose of average difficulty.... The texts have been reprinted in their entirety from standard Russian sources, with notes to Taman' and The Bronze Horseman from Soviet school editions." The book does not have the usual Russian-English vocabulary. This is explained in the Preface thus: "In view of the fact that Harvard and Yale use the selections in different order and for slightly different purposes, and since other users may have still other desiderata, it was decided to omit the usual bilingual notes and vocabulary."

This reviewer is completely mystified as to the purposes for which these selections have been used at Harvard and Yale. When a student completes an "introductory" course in grammar (during which he evidently reads nothing except the detached sentences or the short "connected" texts provided in the textbook to illustrate the use of grammar rules), his passive vocabulary seldom exceeds one thousand words and in most cases is below that figure. At this stage, at least ninety per cent, and probably even more, of the words used in the stories and poems included in this book would be unfamiliar to the student. To make him look up in a dictionary nine out of every ten words of the reading text would not only be a waste of time and effort (and our students have so little time which they can devote to the study of Russian!); what is even worse, it is one of the surest ways to develop in the student a strong aversion for both the Russian language and Russian literature. It is difficult to imagine anything more unpedagogical and harmful, in my opinion, than such "teaching methods." This way of teaching is one of the reasons why Russian has acquired an undeserved reputation of an extremely difficult language.

The notes to Taman' and Mednyj vsadnik were reprinted from Soviet books for Russian adolescents, who speak their language fluently, but such notes are totally inadequate for non-Slavic students who are beginning to read in Russian, and require a great amount of work with a dictionary if they are to be understood at all.

Pikovaja dama, Taman', and two of Čexov's stories, Mal'čiki and Dom s mezoninom were included in the Oxford Russian Readers (published in 1951 and 1953), where they are provided with a vocabulary and excellent explanatory notes in English (although the editors detracted a great deal from the value of both by tucking them away at the end of the book instead of placing them close to the text). Such duplication would be justified if the new reader were better than the old ones. But this is not the case.

This may be a matter of taste, but when non-Russian students are introduced for the first time to Čexov in the original, it seems to me that they should read better stories than the rather mediocre Lev i solnce and Zloj mal'čik or the frivolous and silly Iz vospominanij idealista and Proizvedenie iskusstva. The two short plays by Il'f and Petrov may be amusing when well acted on the stage, but they do not make good reading material for non-Russian students of the language.

Publishers are afraid to publish any Russian textbooks because, they assert, the market for such books is too limited. When a publisher finally picks up enough courage to publish a textbook in our field, surely it ought to be something more useful than a reader without a vocabulary: such a reader is like a rowboat without oars.

Rebecca A. Domar
Columbia University

Alfred Senn. Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. Band II: Lesebuch und Glossar. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1957. 279 pp.

This volume is intended as a reader to accompany a new Lithuanian grammar, soon to be published by Professor Senn. The reading selections are divided into four categories: (1) anonymous folk literature, (2) poetry, (3) prose, and (4) religious literature. According to the author, the reading material was chosen primarily for pedagogical and linguistic purposes. These aims are well served by the variety of selections ranging from the earliest religious literature to the most modern scientific prose.

Preceding each reading selection is an introduction containing general information about the work, its author, his place in Lithuanian literature, etc. Especially helpful are the bibliographical material and the explanations of different orthographic practices found in older texts. Ample footnotes explain difficult constructions and idioms, and give normalized textual readings. Although the introductory material and the footnotes are in German, the glossary lists definitions in both German and English. Most American students of East European languages are accustomed to working with German textbooks, but in general it is better for the beginner not to have to work with a third language when preparing translations.

The accented texts will be very helpful for the beginner because Lithuanian accentuation compares in complexity with that of Serbo-Croatian and Russian. It is noteworthy that certain personal pronouns, adverbs, and prepositions are not marked at all. This agrees with my observation that in the flow of speech of the average Lithuanian these words are frequently unstressed. We presume that as regards the stress, the phonemic situation is similar to that observed in Serbo-Croatian by Carleton T. Hodge in his article "Serbo-Croatian Stress and Pitch," to appear in Vol. III, No. 2, of General Linguistics. In this article Dr. Hodge finds that every phrase

(i. e., breath group terminated by juncture) contains at least one, but not more than two, primary stresses. At present I should not like to commit myself on the number of stresses possible in the Lithuanian phrase, but I do know that not every word receives a stress. In this regard some very interesting remarks precede the poetry selection *Gilšė* by Vincas Krėvė. Here Professor Senn says that rhythmical analysis of Lithuanian must proceed from the rhythmical "member" which consists of a single word or a group of words. In *Gilšė* only the chief stress of each rhythmical member is marked and the secondary stresses go unmarked.

Professor Senn is to be congratulated for compiling a book which will be valuable for students of the Baltic languages, both as an elementary text and as a bibliographical guide for further work in the field.

William Schmalstieg
University of Kentucky

Recent Russian Vocal Recordings; Folk Recordings

Every language teacher sooner or later discovers the instructional value of using recordings of vocal music, especially of opera. Students can pleasurably learn vocabulary and pronunciation, and, at the same time, some of the best accomplishments of Russian culture and even of literature, from Russian operatic recordings. The difficulty has been that recordings of operas in Russian have hitherto been technically or linguistically deficient. If they have been of performances in the Soviet Union, the records have not been of technical quality to compare at all favorably with recordings made elsewhere or even to be listened to with pleasure; whereas performances in Yugoslavia and elsewhere, regardless of their technical quality, have not been sung in good enough Russian to be useful in language teaching. The language teacher has usually preferred, for instructional purposes, the recordings of performances made in Russia, while hoping in vain that Soviet technique in making recordings or master tapes would improve or that they would allow modern recording equipment to be utilized in the Soviet Union.

Though the quality of recent recordings of Russian operatic performances in the Soviet Union has greatly improved, it is still impossible to say that these recordings are "high fidelity." However, they have improved to the point that they can be heard with much more pleasure and that they can be profitably used for language instruction. Westminster has recently released a number of recordings of operas in Soviet performances that are technically the best that have yet appeared, and they have the further great pedagogical advantage that they are accompanied by libretti in Russian (in Cyrillic, in transliteration, and in English translation), and that further copies of the libretti can be obtained from the company (275 Seventh Ave., New York 1).

Up to the present, Westminster has released recordings

of Glinka's Ruslan i Ljudmila (OPW 1401), Čajkovskij's Evgenij Onegin (OPW 1301) and Čarodejka (The Sorceress), Musorgskij-Ippolitov-Inanov's Ženit'ba (The Marriage) (OPW 1202), and Rimskij-Korsakov's Čarskaja nevesta (The Tsar's Bride) (OPW 1303). For language teaching, Evgenij Onegin and Ženit'ba can be especially commended. Evgenij Onegin is of course one of the most popular and worthy representatives of the Russian operatic art and based on one of the greatest Russian literary monuments. Ženit'ba is particularly useful because it is a "recitative opera" without arias, the opera in which Musorgskij learned and demonstrated first his ability to heighten the inflections and rhythms of Russian speech into music.

Vanguard (256 W. 55th St., New York) has also released comparatively recently two Russian operas in Soviet performances: Glinka's Žizn' za Carja—Ivan Susanin (A Life for the Tsar—Ivan Susanin) (VRS 6010/12), and Rimskij-Korsakov's Majskaja noč (May Night) (VRS 6006/8). Žizn' za Carja has great interest as the first Russian "national" opera and as having one of the finest bass roles in all opera. Unfortunately, Vanguard's libretti are given only in English translation, and the recordings, as such, are not so exciting as those on the Westminster labels, though the performances are similarly excellent.

The comparatively primitive nature of recordings made from Soviet tapes is shown by juxtaposition with three really superb Westminster recordings of Russian religious services, all made in this country. The music from the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom has been recorded, with music by various composers (XWN 18204) and in a setting by Arxangel'skij (XWN 18247). Musically the setting by various composers is more interesting and varied, though the setting of Arxangel'skij has a compensating advantage of unity of style. The Russian Orthodox Requiem is sung by a male cappella chorus, in the third of these recordings (XWN 18263), in a particularly excellent and moving performance. All three of these records have the text in Church Slavic and in English translation. They are of linguistic, cultural, religious, and musical interest.

Westminster has also released two records of Russian popular songs, performed in the Soviet Union, one by choruses (WP 6009) and one by soloists (WP 6007), but unfortunately with only English translations. The value and interest of the songs and performers varies greatly.

Folkways Record Sales and Service Corporation (117 W. 46th St., New York 36) has recorded a large number of excellent, authentic performances of folk songs and music of peoples of the Slavic and East European area and of the Soviet Union. Many of these records are accompanied by texts in the original languages and translations of them; they include Russian Folk Songs (FP820), Ukrainian Christmas Songs (FP828), Folk Songs from Czechoslovakia (FP919), Polish Folk Songs and Dances (FP848), Folk Music of Yugoslavia (FP434), Songs and Dances of Yugoslavia (FP805), Folk Songs of Hungary (FP803), Hungarian Folk Songs, Bartok Collection (P1000), Finnish Folk Songs (FW856), Lithuanian Songs (P1009), and Music of the

U.S.S.R. Middle East (Azerbaidzhan, Tartar, Tadzhik, Kazakh, Dagestan; FP916). Instrumental records or vocal records accompanied by notes—sometimes translations—but not original texts, include Russian Choral Music (from the Ukraine, Caucasasia, Gur'ya, Georgia, Voronia; FP54), Music of the Ukraine (instrumental; P443), the Yugoslav National Folk Ballet—Tanec (mainly dances, but some vocal music; FP80/3), Folk Music of Rumania (P419), and Music of the Russian Middle East (music of Armenia, Uzbekistan, and Azerbaidzhan; P416). In addition, Music of the World's Peoples, Volume II (P505) contains, among samples of music of many other peoples, single pieces of music from the Ukraine (song—no text), Serbia, Albania, Finland (song with text and translation), and Azerbaidzhan (song—no text); and Volume III (P506) contains, among other samples, specimens of Caucasian Georgian, Russian Gypsy, Hungarian Gypsy, and Bulgarian music, and a sample of Yugoslav epic song (without text).

All these recordings have a high degree of technical excellence. They may be used in appropriate language and culture courses, to give students the language and the feeling of folk culture of the various Slavic and East European nationalities and of peoples of the Soviet Union.

J. T. S.

New Editions; Moscow Translations of Russian Classics

Gleb Struve's Geschichte der Sowjetliteratur (München: Isar Verlag [c. 1957], 595 pp.) gives the history of Soviet literature up to November 1957, and hence becomes the most useful and authoritative book on Soviet literature, replacing his own Soviet Russian Literature: 1917-1950 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press [c. 1951]). Professor Struve's new book is a translation of his earlier work, with a final chapter of some seventy pages on developments in Soviet literature since the death of Stalin, including the "thaw," the Second Congress of Soviet Writers, the clamor over Literary Moscow, Dudincev's Not by Bread Alone, and other works, and Xruščev's 1957 pronouncements with regard to art and literature.

An extremely important reissue is that of Leon Trotsky, History of the Russian Revolution (3 vols. in one; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press [1957]; xxii, 483; xi, 349; 504; \$12.50). This History, in Max Eastman's readable translation, was first published in English in 1932; the reissue is complete and unabridged. It remains one of the most interesting histories of the Russian Revolution, by one of its most important participants.

A number of English translations of Russian works either out of print in English translation or never translated have recently become available in publications by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow, and supplied for review by Collet's Holdings, Ltd., 44-45 Museum Street, London (the prices listed here are theirs). They include the only available translations of Lermontov's Hero of Our Time (6/6), Gončarov's

Same Old Story (Obyknovennaja istorija) (7/6), and Tales from Saltykov-Shchedrin, and the only available separate editions of Puškin's Dubrovsky (2/6), Gogol's Taras Bulba (3/6), and Turgenev's Three Short Novels (Asya, First Love, and Spring Torrents) (5/6).

The translations from Lermontov, Gončarov, and Saltykov-Shchedrin are especially valuable. The general quality of the Moscow translations leaves much to be desired in accuracy and idiom, but their availability in English is nevertheless noteworthy, as making it possible for the student who cannot read the original to obtain some acquaintance with these important works.

J. T. S.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Alexandrov, Victor. Khrushchev of the Ukraine: A Biography. New York: Philosophical Library [c. 1957]. vi, 216, \$4.75.
- Anon. Le livre de la genèse du peuple Ukrainien. Tr. Georges Luciani. (Collection historique de l'Institut d'Études slaves, XVII.) Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 1956. 149 pp.
- Barghoorn, Frederick C. Soviet Russian Nationalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. ix, 330, \$7.00.
- Bauer, Raymond A., Alex Inkeles, and Clyde Kluckhohn. How the Soviet System Works. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956. xiv, 274, \$4.75.
- Bezuško, Volodimir. Mykola Hohol': Literaturna studija. Winnipeg: Kul'tura i Osvita, 1956. 104 pp.
- Black, C. E., ed. Rewriting Russian History: Soviet Interpretation of Russia's Past. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1956. xv, 413, \$7.50.
- Bone, Edith. 7 Years' Solitary: The Story of a Remarkable Woman Who Triumphed over Her Captors. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1957. 256 pp., \$4.50.
- Braun, Maximilian. Lebensbeschreibung des Despoten Stefan Lazarevic von Konstantin dem Philosophen. (Slavo-Orientalia, I.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1956. ix, 69.
- von Bubnoff, Nicolai. Russische Religions-Philosophen: Dokumente. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1956. 494 pp.
- Bugelski, B. R., ed. Mickiewicz and the West: A Symposium. (University of Buffalo Studies, XXIII/1.) Buffalo, N. Y.: University of Buffalo, 1956. 75 pp., \$1.50.
- Chekhov, Anton. Best Plays. Tr. Stark Young. New York: Modern Library, 1956. xiii, 296, \$1.65.

- Chiang Chung-cheng (Chiang Kai-shek). Soviet Russia in China: A Summing-up at Seventy. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1957. 392 pp., \$5.00.
- Fr.-Chirovsky, Nicholas L. Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957. xv, 178, \$3.75.
- Čiževskij, Dmitrij. Aus zwei Welten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der slavisch-westlichen literarischen Beziehungen. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, X.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1956. viii, 352.
- _____. On Romanticism in Slavic Literatures. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1957. 63 pp.
- Crankshaw, Edward. Russia Without Stalin: The Emerging Pattern. New York: Viking Press, 1956. v, 264, \$3.75.
- Cvetaeva, Marina. Lebedinyj stan: Stixi 1917-1921 gg. Ed. G. P. Struve, Introd. Ju. P. Ivask. München, 1957. 64 pp.
- Dallin, Alexander. German Rule in Russia 1941-1945: A Study of Occupation Policies. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1957. xx, 695, \$10.00.
- Decaux, Étienne. Morphologie des enclitiques polonais. (Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, XXIII.) Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 1955. 237 pp.
- Deutscher, Isaac. Russia in Transition and Other Essays. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1957. viii, 245, \$4.50.
- Djilas, Milovan. The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1957. vii, 214, \$3.95.
- Dmytryshyn, Basil. Moscow and the Ukraine 1918-1953: A Study of Russian Bolshevik Nationality Policy. New York: Bookman Associates [c. 1956]. 310 pp.
- van der Eng, J. Dostoevskij romancier: Rapports entre sa vision du monde et ses procédés littéraires. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, XIII.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1957. 115 pp.
- Farrell, R. Barry. Jugoslavia and the Soviet Union 1948-1956: An Analysis with Documents. [Hamden, Conn.]: The Shoe String Press, 1956. vii, 220, \$5.00.
- Fast, Howard. The Naked God: The Writer and the Communist Party. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1957]. 197 pp.
- Fischer-Galati, Stephen, ed. Romania. (East-Central Europe Under the Communists: Mid-European Studies Center Series.) New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1957]. xv, 399, \$8.50.
- Frank, S. L. Biografija P. B. Struve. New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1956. 237 pp., \$2.25.
- Franko, I. Nazvoznavci praci. (Onomastica, No. 14.) Winnipeg: UVAN, 1957. 80 pp.

- Gibian, George. Tolstoj and Shakespeare. (Musagetes, IV.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1957. 47 pp.
- Gogol, Nikolai. Dead Souls. Tr. George Reavey. (World's Classics, No. 556.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. ix, 464, \$2.50.
- Grinioff, Vladimir B. Tale of a Whistling Shrimp. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1957. 251 pp., \$3.50.
- Grosberg, John. The E.U.P. Concise Russian and English Dictionary. London: English Universities Press, 1957. xvii, 271.
- Gruhiow, Leo, ed. Current Soviet Policies, II: The Documentary Record of the 20th Communist Party Congress and Its Aftermath. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1957. ii, 248, \$6.00.
- Helmreich, Ernst C., ed. Hungary. (East-Central Europe Under the Communists: Mid-European Studies Center Series.) New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1957]. xiv, 466, \$8.50.
- Huettl-Worth, Gerta. Die Bereicherung des Russischen Wortschatzes im XVIII. Jahrhundert. Wien: Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg., 1956. 232 pp. Available Schoenhof's Foreign Books, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., \$5.10.
- Kadić, Ante. Croatian Reader with Vocabulary. (University of California Syllabus Series, No. 361.) Berkeley: University of California, 1957. v, 212, \$2.50.
- _____. Modern Yugoslav Literature: An Anthology with Biographical Sketches. (University of California Syllabus Series, No. 347.) Berkeley: University of California, 1956. 172 pp., \$3.50.
- Kamenetsky, Ihor. Hitler's Occupation of Ukraine (1941-1944): A Study of Totalitarian Imperialism. (Marquette Slavic Studies, II.) Milwaukee, Wisc.: The Marquette University Press, 1956. [vi,] 101, \$3.00.
- Karamzin, N. M. Letters of a Russian Traveler 1789-1790: An Account of a Young Russian Gentleman's Tour Through Germany, Switzerland, France, and England. Tr. and abridged by Florence Jonas. Introd. Leon Stilman. (Columbia Slavic Studies.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. ix, 351, \$5.00.
- Kirkconnell, W. The Place of Slavic Studies in Canada. (Slavistica, No. 31.) Winnipeg: UVAN, 1958. 14 pp.
- Kline, George L., ed. Soviet Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. xi, 192, \$3.50.
- Kovaliv, P. Participial Adjectives in the Slavic Languages. (Slavistica, No. 29.) Winnipeg: UVAN, 1957. 41 pp.
- Kridl, Manfred. A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture. Tr. Olga Scherer-Virski. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, IX.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1956. viii, 525, \$9.50.

[To be continued]

NEWS AND NOTES

Russian in American Secondary Schools

The break through the space barrier by the Soviet Sputniks has radically changed the attitude of American educators and the American public toward the study of Russian, especially in secondary schools. Every day brings more news of Russian added to the curriculum of high schools, or of plans to add it. Though the number of high schools offering Russian is still modest, indications are that the number may explode upwards this year. The AATSEEL, through the Executive Secretary and Treasurer, offers a means for institutions and qualified teachers to get together, and the Journal will act as a clearing house of information. All members of the profession are urged to keep the Editor informed of developments.

National Education Association—Sponsored Conference Urges the Introduction of Russian into American High Schools. The Conference on the Academically Talented Pupil in the American Secondary School, which met under the auspices of the National Education Association from February 6 to 8, 1958, came out strongly in favor of introducing Russian into the American high school:

It is a matter of great national urgency that more Americans know Russian. It is therefore strongly recommended that as fast as possible, when proper conditions exist and adequate instruction can be made available, the study of Russian be introduced in the public high schools of the country. Such study when begun should be carried to a point of reasonable proficiency and suitable opportunities provided therefor, especially for the academically talented pupil.

(The Conference, which was attended by about 200 scholars, including teachers, administrators, and researchers, defined the "academically talented" student as in the upper 15 to 20 percent of the students of the "typical comprehensive" high school; the figure might be as high as 90 percent in certain selective high schools.) The entire report, "Educating the Academically Talented Secondary School Pupil in Modern Language," is of great interest and importance. The effort will be made to make it available to readers of the Journal—in the summer issue, if not before.

Present Situation (Progress Report of the Committee on Promoting the Study of Russian in High Schools—Professor Helen Yakobson, George Washington University, Chairman). At present there are ten public high schools teaching Russian:

three in Portland, Oregon; one in Eveleth, Minnesota; one in Minneapolis, Minnesota; one in Des Plaines, Illinois; one in St. Louis, Missouri; one in Ann Arbor, Michigan; one in Kent, Ohio; and one in Brooklyn, New York. In addition, an evening course in Russian has been started at Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Indiana, with high school students, as well as adults, as enrollees. Also, eight private secondary schools now teach Russian: three in New York, one in New Hampshire, one in Massachusetts, one in Connecticut, one in Washington, D. C., and one in Virginia. Several public high schools plan to initiate Russian next year: Hammond High School, Hammond, Indiana; Frankfort High School, Frankfort, Indiana; Huron High School, Huron, South Dakota; Wakefield High School, Arlington, Virginia; and on the West Coast—Brewster High School, Brewster, Washington; Madison High School, Portland, Oregon; and Oxnard, Camarillo, and Capuchino High Schools in California. The Elkhart High School, Elkhart, Indiana, plans to initiate a special intensive course in Russian this summer. The Board of Education in Westport, Connecticut, is planning to introduce Russian next year.

A survey made by Brooklyn College gives these results of a questionnaire submitted to State Departments of Education: Out of 34 departments replying, ten stated that they would be willing to introduce Russian if qualified teachers are available. Six high school principals in New York City responded favorably to the idea of introducing Russian.

Russian teacher training programs have already been started at the University of Minnesota and Brooklyn College. Three courses in Russian for teachers were started in February in Brooklyn and Queens, New York. The Middlebury College Russian School this summer will have a course in methodology for teachers of Russian. An Institute for prospective high school teachers of Russian is planned in connection with the Russian Workshop at Indiana University this summer. Included in President Eisenhower's Bill for Education is a plan for sponsoring language training institutes in the so-called "unusual languages"; future teachers of Russian can be recruited from graduates of these institutes.

At the request of Dr. Corning, Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia, Professor Yakobson prepared a report The Study of Russian in American High Schools, which contains general information and answers to such most often asked questions as why should we study Russian, what texts can be used, and what is being done in regard to introducing Russian in the high schools. The report may be obtained from Dr. Majorie Johnston, U. S. Office of Education, 330 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C.

Professor Catherine Wolkonsky of Vassar College has contacted the College Board authorities and was advised that, as soon as any school has 50 students requesting that Russian be included in the College Board exams, this will be done.

The Administration's Education Bill (H. R. 10273 in the House of Representatives and S. 3163 in the Senate). Though the science proposals of this bill have been given wider publicity, the bill itself equally stresses the urgent need for language training, especially to "advance the study of Russian

and the principal languages of Asia and Africa." Among the proposals of the bill are (1) foreign language institutes, to provide further training designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of foreign language teaching, with financial assistance for the establishment and operation of the institutes and with scholarships for students; (2) foreign language centers, to provide instruction in languages, including Russian, which are "rarely" taught in the United States, with financial assistance for establishment, operation, and for scholarships; and (3) substantial funds (\$175,000) for surveys, research, and materials development in the most effective methods of teaching foreign languages. The Democrats have introduced a "National Defense Education Bill," even more generous in appropriations, but which does not treat foreign languages separately. Senators and Congressmen will be interested in the opinions of members of the profession, of students and their parents, with regard to these proposals.

Chapter Meetings

New York Chapter (reported by Prof. S. J. Sluszk). With 41 members and guests attending, the New York AATSEEL Chapter's fifteenth annual fall conference convened at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, on Saturday morning and afternoon, October 26, 1957, with Chapter President Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar College, as chairman. In the morning session, Prof. Konstantin Solntsev, AFIT Russian Program, Syracuse University, reviewed recent Soviet dictionaries. Next, honoring the centenary of the Polish-English author Joseph Conrad, Prof. Bogdan Pawlowicz, Lublin Professor of Polish Studies at Canisius College, discussed "Joseph Conrad as a Pole." Prof. Kyra Bostroem, University of Connecticut, gave a report on the MLA-AATSEEL Conferences held in Madison, Wisconsin, in September, including the establishment and plans of the AATSEEL Committee on Promoting the Study of Russian in High Schools. Professor Filia Holtzman, Brooklyn College, reported for the New York AATSEEL Committee on the Status and Place of Russian Language in College Accreditation [see "Russian in American Secondary Schools" above.] It was voted that the Committee continue its work, that a further report be made at the Spring meeting, and that reports be sent to the national Secretary of the AATSEEL and the MLA. The morning session concluded with reports of research in progress.

In the afternoon session, after a welcome in the name of Cornell University by Prof. J. Milton Cown, head of the Division of Modern Languages, Prof. Gordon H. Fairbanks, Cornell University, spoke on "The Application of Linguistics to the Teaching of the Russian Language." Dr. Nicholas Peruvshin, head of the United Nations Translation School, gave a "New Theory of the Migration of the Indo-European Linguistic Family." Prof. Fan Parker, Brooklyn College, reported on her second recent trip to the U.S.S.R., in her paper "Soviet Education in 1957." Prof. M. Gardiner Clark, Cornell University, showed a series of photographs and slides he took during

his trip to the U.S.S.R. in 1957. Officers elected for 1958 were the following: president, Prof. Albert Parry, Colgate University; vice presidents, Prof. Holtzman, Dr. Pervushin, and Prof. Augusta Jaryc, Cornell University; and secretary-treasurer, Dr. Sluscka, Fordham University. The next meeting of the Chapter will be at Brooklyn College on April 26, 1958.

Massachusetts Chapter (reported by Prof. Leon Twarog). The Massachusetts AATSEEL Chapter held its annual meeting at the Modern Language Center, Harvard University, on December 7, 1957, with Prof. Twarog, Boston University, presiding. Sister Marie Margarita, Emmanuel College, the first of three speakers, discussed "Techniques of the Modern Language Workshop," on the basis of experience at Emmanuel. Dr. Bronislas Jezierski, Tufts University, read a paper on "Poland's Angry Young Man—Marek Hlasko," whose moral indignation and rage make him a symbol of young Poles today. Prof. Michael Karpovich, Harvard University, in "Some Comments on Recent Developments in Soviet Literature," presented the thesis that Dudincev's Not by Bread Alone is not so important, from either a literary or an ideological point of view, as the non-fiction articles in the collection Literary Moscow, for they express a genuine hope for the development of true literary values and a break with the stereotyped patterns of Socialist Realism. At the business meeting, Sister Marie Margarita was elected president, and H. Prokloff-Renick, Studio of the Russian Language, was re-elected Secretary-Treasurer.

Summer Programs 1958

Middlebury College. The Russian School will have its fourteenth session, under the directorship of Prof. Mischa Fayer, from June 27 to August 14, with its usual broad course offerings and a distinguished staff of native teachers. In addition, under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, there will be held concurrently an Institute of Russian Studies, to give specialists in Social Science fields near-native fluency in oral as well as written Russian and competence in their fields of specialization. The faculty of the Institute includes Profs. Nicholas S. Timasheff and George A. Taskin of Fordham University, Nicholas E. Efromov of the Committee for Liberation, and Nicholas P. Poltoratzky of Brooklyn College.

Colby College. The Colby College School of Languages, directed by Prof. John F. McCoy, offers intensive courses on the college level in French, German, Russian, and Spanish, in its eleventh session, from June 24 to August 11. The staff will consist of some eighteen or nineteen teachers, and an enrollment of some 135-140 students is anticipated.

Fordham University. The Institute of Russian Studies will offer a summer session in Russian Studies, from July 7 to August 14, including courses in the Russian language, Soviet periodical literature, history, and economics. The Lithuanian Program, also under the direction of the Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, will operate concurrently. Sixteen students

were enrolled in the initial session of this program in 1957, in courses in Lithuanian literature, history, and civilization. The program will be continued during the summer sessions of 1958 and 1959, for its first three-summer cycle, leading to a Certificate of Completion.

Indiana University. The Eighth Annual Russian Workshop, with a staff of experienced native or bilingual speakers and with a small maximum number of students to be accepted, will be conducted from June 16 to July 19, under the directorship of Prof. J. T. Shaw. In conjunction with the Russian Workshop, there will be an Institute to prepare teachers for offering Russian in high schools.

Executive Secretary and Treasurer's Report for 1957

Receipts

Regular or associate memberships.	\$1120.00
Memberships at student rates	88.00
3 single copies purchased.	4.50
Institutional subscriptions	220.00
Advertisements	335.00
Reprints	95.60
Total	<hr/> \$1863.10

Disbursements

Printing and shipping of Vol. XV of the <u>SEEJ</u> and reprints	\$1531.92
Stamps, envelopes and supplies	198.75
Advertisement in MLA program booklet	33.33
Bank charges	9.37
Total	<hr/> \$1773.37

Balance in bank on December 31, 1957 \$89.73

Note: While Prof. Claude Lemieux was Secretary-Treasurer and Editor of the Journal of the AATSEEL, a change was made, so that now all membership dues are paid for the calendar year. This change, necessary for book-keeping purposes, meant that funds were lacking for the final, December 1956, issue of The AATSEEL Journal. Prof. Lemieux generously took on the financial responsibility for publishing that last issue, and made it possible for the present Executive Secretary and Treasurer to begin operations with a clear financial slate.

Edmund Ordon

BOOKS ABROAD

An International Literary Quarterly

Established in 1927 by Roy Temple House to promote
international understanding by disseminating literary information

Editor and Manager: Ernst Erich Noth

Featuring articles on the situation and evolution of the world's various national literatures, contemporary authors, literary trends and schools; reviews of recently published foreign books in the fields of creative writing, literary criticism, and all branches of the humanities; and a selective bibliographical appraisal of four hundred American and foreign literary and cultural periodicals.

"The Euramerica of criticism."—*J. F. Angelloz.*

"The conception of a 'world literature' brought nearer its realization."—*Max Brod.*

"Helpfully widens the horizon of critics and readers."—*Lion Feuchtwanger.*

"The only international critical publication which is at the same time complete, objective, and careful of literary standards."—*André Maurois.*

"Revelation and fulfillment of love for all mankind."—*Walter von Molo.*

"A first unity among the Nations."—*Sean O'Casey.*

"A unique publication in character and coverage."—*Alfonso Reyes.*

"A patient and important service in making the books of the rest of the world available to Americans."—*Upton Sinclair.*

\$1.25 a copy; \$4.00 a year; two years \$7.00

Mail subscriptions to:
Circulation Manager, Books Abroad
University of Oklahoma Press
Norman, Okla.

THE LITHUANIAN PROGRAM

Second Summer Session—1958
July 7 — August 14

Courses in Elementary, Intermediate, and Advanced Lithuanian language, History, Literature, Civilization with discussion Seminars lead to Certificate of Completion. A unique and concentrated program in the United States. Scholarship aid available. Morning sessions only.

For information write to:

THE LITHUANIAN PROGRAM
Fordham University, Box 566
New York 58, New York

S L A V I C A

All on Eastern Europe

Rare and Out of Print Books

Scholarly Books published in
Eastern Europe

Catalogues issued monthly

Want Lists invited

DR. ALEXANDER HERTZ

77-05 41st Avenue
Jackson Heights 73, L.I., N.Y.
Telephone: HA9 40-82